

VOLUME XV

DECEMBER, 1929

NUMBER 8

# BULLETIN

OF

## THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

ANNUAL MEETING  
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH  
COLLEGE ATHLETICS

PUBLISHED BY  
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS  
20TH AND NORTHAMPTON STS., EASTON, PA.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE: JOSEPH ALLEN; PAUL KAUFMAN;  
JOSEPH MAYER; H. W. TYLER, *Chairman*

26 JACKSON PLACE  
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Issued monthly except in June, July, August, and September

---

Entered as Second-class matter, April 24, 1922, at the Post Office at  
Easton, Pa., under the act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,  
Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on September 13, 1918.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### Notes and Announcements

Annual Meeting .....	573
Council Meeting .....	575
College Entrance Examination Board .....	576

### Academic Freedom and Tenure

University of Pittsburgh .....	578
--------------------------------	-----

### Reviews

College Athletics, " <i>Bulletin 23</i> ," A. W. Rowe .....	592
Charles W. Eliot, <i>The Man and His Beliefs</i> , A. Warren ..	596
Learning and Leadership, G. R. Coffman .....	601
The Choice of an Occupation, D. T. Howard .....	604

### Educational Discussion

Carnegie Foundation. Report on American College Ath- letics .....	607
The Teacher, Again, G. Norlin .....	616
The Improvement of Modern Language Teaching, R. H. <i>Fife</i> .....	620

### Local and Chapter Notes

Michigan, Academic Freedom .....	624
South Dakota, A Protest .....	625
Official Visits .....	625

### Membership

Members Elected .....	626
Nominations for Membership .....	630

### Appointment Service Announcements

Vacancies Reported .....	634
Teachers Available .....	635

Contents of previous issues of the *Bulletin* of the Association of University Professors may be found by consulting the EDUCATIONAL INDEX.

## NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

ANNUAL MEETING.—The sixteenth Annual Meeting is to be held in connection with the American Historical Association at Duke University and the University of North Carolina.

*Headquarters* at the Washington Duke Hotel, Durham, N. C. The Monday sessions will be at Chapel Hill, with luncheon at the Carolina Inn. Reservations should be made promptly at one or both of the hotels. *Transportation* between Durham and Chapel Hill (twelve miles) will be arranged by special buses at \$1.00 for the round trip.

Members of the Association are invited by the Committee on Local Arrangements to participate in events arranged for the American Historical Association, including a Smoker, Monday evening, luncheons, Tuesday and Wednesday, and Tea on Tuesday.

The program of the Historical Association begins Monday afternoon with meetings at Durham. Members unable to come to the Saturday session may find it to their advantage to communicate with the office of the Historical Association, 40 B Street, S. W., Washington, D. C., in regard to special trains or cars leaving New York and other points on Sunday.

*Reduced Railroad Rates.* Members should purchase first-class, one-way tickets to Durham, N. C., securing from the railway agent for each ticket purchased a "certificate for the Convention of the American Historical Association and Associated Societies." It will be necessary for the holder of a railway certificate to register at the convention upon arrival and to call a day or two later for his validated certificate. A registration fee of 50 cents is to be paid by each person registering.

*Railroad Certificates* should be left promptly at the registration desk.

*Local Committee:* Professors Norman Foerster, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C., *Chairman*, Allan H. Gilbert, Duke University, Durham, *Secretary*, R. E. Coker, G. D. Collins, F. H. Edminster, W. W. Pierson, J. F. Rippey, and N. I. White.

## PROGRAM

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 28, 1929

Duke University

10.30 A.M. *First Session.*

University Ethics, Report of Committee I, Prof. W. B. Munro, *Chairman*, Harvard University.  
Academic Freedom and Tenure, Report of Committee A, Prof. A. L. Wheeler, *Chairman*, Princeton University.  
Pensions and Insurance, Report of Committee P, Prof. E. W. Patterson, *Chairman*, Columbia University.  
Student Health, Report of Committee N, Prof. J. E. Raycroft, *Chairman*, Princeton University.  
Brief Reports from other Committees.

2.00 P.M. *Second Session.*

College Athletics, Discussion of the Report of the Carnegie Foundation, opened by Dean S. V. Sanford, University of Georgia.  
Some Lessons from the History of the American Bar Association, Dean J. G. Rogers, University of Colorado.  
Aims, Methods, and Results of the American Medical Association, Prof. A. C. Ivy, Northwestern University.

7.00 P.M. *Annual Dinner.*

Addresses by President Joseph S. Ames, Johns Hopkins University.  
Addresses by Representatives of Duke University, the University of North Carolina, and of the American Historical Association.  
Tickets \$2.00, at the registration desk.

MONDAY, DECEMBER 30, 1929

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

10.00 A.M. *Third Session.*

Required Courses in Education, Report of Committee, Prof. R. C. Flickinger, *Chairman*, University of Iowa.



Proposal of the Association of American Colleges  
(President J. L. McConaughy, Wesleyan University).  
See page 619.

Relations of Faculties and Governing Boards. Plan for  
an Inquiry, presented by representatives of the Univer-  
sity of North Carolina Chapter.

Reports from the Officers and the Council, with an ac-  
count of the Washington Office, the Appointment Ser-  
vice, and Junior Membership.

Constitutional Amendments.

Report of the Nominating Committee and Election of  
Officers.

Miscellaneous Business.

2.00 P.M. Meeting of the Council for 1930.

COUNCIL MEETING.—The fall meeting of the Council was held at New York, November 9, with fourteen members present. After discussion of the general situation and problems of the Association, it was voted as the unanimous opinion of the Council that the budget for 1930 should provide for whatever increased expense may be due to growth of membership; for the holding of a subsidized delegate meeting in 1930, and for compensation of the proposed general secretary and executive secretary.

It was the sense of the Council that the Association should consider the advisability of meeting near the end of November, 1930, in the middle West.

It was further voted to invite the present Secretary to continue in the service of the Association at the Washington Office, beginning September 1.

It was voted to authorize the officers to express disapproval of the customs censorship of books and to recommend corresponding action by chapters.

It was voted to approve the following statement in regard to notice of resignation by members of faculties:

Any provision in regard to notification of resignation by a college teacher will naturally depend on the conditions of tenure in the institution. If a college asserts and exercises the right to dismiss, promote, or change salary at short notice or exercises the discretion implied by annual contracts, it must expect that members of its staff will feel under no obligations beyond the legal requirements of their

contracts. If, on the other hand, the institution undertakes to comply with the tenure specifications approved by the Association of American Colleges, it would seem appropriate for the member of the staff to act in accordance with the following provision:

1. Notification of resignation by a college teacher ought in general to be early enough to obviate serious embarrassment to the institution, the length of time necessarily varying with the circumstances of his particular case.

2. Subject to this general principle it would seem appropriate that a professor or an associate professor should ordinarily give not less than four months' notice and an assistant professor or instructor not less than three months' notice.

3. In regard to offering appointments to men in the service of other institutions, it is believed that an informal inquiry as to whether a teacher would be willing to consider transfer under specified conditions may be made at any time and without previous consultation with his superiors, with the understanding, however, that if a definite offer follows he will not accept it without giving such notice as is indicated in the preceding provisions. He is at liberty to ask his superior officers to reduce, or waive the notification requirements there specified, but he should be expected to conform to their decision on these points.

4. Violation of these provisions may be brought to the attention of the officers of the Association with the possibility of subsequent publication in particular cases after the facts are duly established.

It was voted to appoint a special committee to report on The Relations of Junior Colleges to the Standards of College and University Work which the Association represents.

It was voted to continue the publication of the list of members in the January *Bulletin* in substantially the present form.

It was voted to recommend the adoption of The Amendment to the Constitution printed in the November *Bulletin*.

The appointment of Professor Paul Kaufman as a member of the editorial committee was approved.

COLLEGE ENTRANCE EXAMINATION BOARD.—The annual report of the Secretary presented at the meeting of the Board in October includes a discussion of the examinations in Latin, French, and Elementary Algebra, and announces an examination for foreigners who

wish to study in the United States to be held for the first time in April, 1930.

The total number of candidates examined by the Board in June, 1929, was 22,724 showing little change since 1926. Slightly more than half the candidates sought admission to New England colleges. The number of New Plan candidates has increased from 2700, in 1926, to 4054. The expense of the Board per candidate is at present slightly over \$11. The total receipts, \$265,000.

MARCH, 1929, ISSUE OF THE BULLETIN.—On account of the increase in membership the reserve supply of this issue has run short. Members who have extra copies are invited to send them to the Washington office. Thirty-five cents will be paid for each copy until further notice.

## ACADEMIC FREEDOM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

At the request of the officers of the American Association of University Professors, the undersigned members visited the University of Pittsburgh on May 30 and 31, to inquire into the status of academic freedom and tenure in that university. The occasion of the inquiry was the wide publicity given to two events that occurred about the end of April: the dissolution of the Liberal Club by the authorities of the University, and the dismissal of Mr. F. E. Woltman, a graduate Assistant in Philosophy.

Since the regular academic session was practically finished an extended investigation was impossible. In the two days at our disposal we had conversations with Chancellor John G. Bowman, Dean L. P. Sieg, of the College and Graduate School, and with some sixteen members of the faculty. We obtained also a considerable mass of documents and press clippings. Our findings, accordingly, are not put forward as the result of a complete and formal investigation; they represent rather the impressions which two friendly observers obtained from a fair sampling of faculty opinion. Neither can they claim the finality of a judicial process, but are offered for the good that they may possibly do in a bad situation.

Since the dissolution of the Liberal Club and the dismissal of Mr. Woltman have been widely discussed, we shall state first the salient facts connected with those two incidents and our opinion relative to them. We shall conclude with some observations of a general nature upon academic freedom and tenure at the University of Pittsburgh.

### THE DISSOLUTION OF THE LIBERAL CLUB

*Statement of facts:* The Liberal Club of the University of Pittsburgh was one of the 134 student organizations, each functioning under the guidance of a faculty advisory committee acceptable to the administration. The advisers for the Liberal Club were Professors R. S. Boots (Political Science), B. J. Hovde (History), P. W. Whiting (Zoology), and C. E. Warne (Economics). All the meetings required the approval of the faculty committee.

On April 12, 1929, the executive committee of the Liberal Club projected a meeting to discuss the Mooney-Billings case, secured the approval of the faculty committee in the usual manner, and on

April 18, obtained the permission of the University Registrar to use a room in Alumni Hall for a meeting to be held on the afternoon of April 22. Three days before the latter date, a printed announcement appeared on the campus listing the names of those who were to address the meeting, and specifically stating that its purpose was "To demand the unconditional release of Thomas Mooney and Warren K. Billings." On the same day, the permit to hold the meeting was withdrawn and the secretary of the club was notified to this effect. The leaders were summoned to appear in the office of the Dean of Men at the hour scheduled for the meeting and at that time they were warned that the club would probably be dissolved and some of its members expelled unless it ceased its propaganda activities. On the day of the proposed meeting, it happened that Professor Harry Elmer Barnes was lecturing in Pittsburgh and he was invited by representatives of the Liberal Club to address the Mooney-Billings meeting. The faculty advisory committee promptly approved the appearance of Professor Barnes on the University campus, but had no knowledge of the fact that the Liberal Club's permit for the use of a university building had been revoked. It appears that the administration had not notified the faculty advisers of its action, and the leaders of the Liberal Club were careful not to reveal the fact that the use of a room had been denied.

When Professor Barnes arrived to address the meeting, he was notified that the permit to the Liberal Club had been revoked three days before and that the meeting could not be held on university property. When an effort was made to hold the meeting on the steps of Thaw Hall, a university officer again notified the speaker of the action of the administration, and Professor Barnes finally delivered his address from the running-board of an automobile parked in a lot near university property.

Considerable publicity followed the event, and the Liberal Club made several attempts to hold meetings to discuss its difficulties with the administration. On April 24 the club was officially dissolved by the university authorities. In a meeting held off the campus the club determined to continue its activities, and on May 2 two students who had been leaders in these events, *viz.*, William Albertson and Arthur McDowell, were expelled from the University. At the same time F. E. Woltman was dismissed from his graduate assistantship and expelled from the University.

A statement by the administration of the University's position

was published in the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette* of May 3, 1929: The Liberal Club existed "to conduct open-minded investigations of pressing social problems." Of this aim the University had approved. But the circular for the Mooney-Billings meeting, demanding the release of Mooney and Billings, showed that the purpose of the club "had now degenerated to desire for propaganda and publicity." The truth of falsity of the propaganda was not the issue. The issue was that the club, with its president known as a Communist and aided by organizations or individuals outside of Pittsburgh and in Pittsburgh, was using the name of the University to advance its propaganda and publicity.

The administration asserts that the Liberal Club was dissolved solely for violating the rules and regulations of the University. It insists that no issue of freedom of speech, or the fitness of Professor Barnes to speak, was involved, but simply the infraction of rules. In particular, the Liberal Club is held to have violated the long-established policy of the University not to "give sanction to propaganda or to allow itself to be used for propaganda; the more so when the doctrine is in any way disloyal to the government of the city, state, or nation."

The Liberal Club published its position in a special pamphlet and also in the *Pittsburgh Press*, April 25, 1929. It asserts that "The whole range of academic freedom is concerned. . . . We consider a university campus the fittest of all places for a free discussion of any ideas, theories, or practices that are current anywhere in the world." Furthermore, the Club calls attention to the fact that other student clubs, such as the Liberal Club of the University of Wisconsin, have taken a similar position on the Mooney-Billings case, and that distinguished Americans like John Dewey, Alexander Meiklejohn, E. A. Ross, John R. Commons, Jerome Davis, Stephen S. Wise, and Glenn Frank have joined in the appeal for the release of Mooney and Billings.

The expelled students have appealed to the courts for reinstatement and their case is pending. They are represented in this litigation by the counsel of the American Civil Liberties Union.

*Findings:* The American Association of University Professors cannot concern itself in a case of student discipline as such, even though such discipline may be unjust and excessive. There is no doubt that the Liberal Club of the University of Pittsburgh was insubordinate (a) in securing the approval of their faculty advisers



for an address by Professor Harry Elmer Barnes while suppressing the information that the Mooney-Billings meeting had been barred from the campus; (b) in attempting to hold this meeting on university property after they had been forbidden to do so by the authorities of the University; (c) in trying to hold meetings on the campus after the official dissolution of the Club. The punishment proper for these acts of insubordination lies within the discretion of the faculty and administration of the University, and such discretion is not subject to review on the ground of academic freedom. In this case, however, the faculty was not consulted by the administration.

The only point where the freedom proper to a university is involved is in the propriety of barring from the campus a student organization solely because it had advertised a meeting "to demand the unconditional release" of Mooney and Billings, rather than to hold an open discussion of the case. The university authorities rest their case for withdrawing permission to hold the meeting solely on the ground that the Club was thereby proved to be an organization for propaganda, contrary to the purpose expressed in its constitution.

In our opinion the position of the University authorities displays an unreasonable fear lest the University should be involved by the action of a student organization. Even though such an organization chose to father a campaign for the release of Mooney and Billings, and even though the University permitted such a protest to be made on its property, we do not believe that any right-thinking person would regard the University as involving itself in propaganda. By taking the position that any expression of opinion by a student organization can range the University as such on one side of a controversial question, the authorities have placed the University in an impossible situation. A university has an undoubted right to prevent any group, composed of students or of faculty, from misrepresenting its relation to the university organization and thereby claiming an authority which it does not possess. If this were to happen, the misrepresentation would be of the essence of the case, but the authorities of the University of Pittsburgh do not allege misrepresentation by the Liberal Club. So long as a group of students speaks in its own name, we believe that it ought to be unmolested in its expression of opinion on public questions. Any other position implies an intolerable censorship of all student opinion by the administration.

## DISMISSAL OF F. E. WOLTMAN

*Statement of Facts:* During the academic year 1928-29, Frederick E. Woltman was a graduate student and graduate assistant in the department of Philosophy at the University of Pittsburgh. Before his appointment he had been an undergraduate in the department of political science at the University and had received the M.A. degree in politics and philosophy. He had interested himself in the coal strike and is said to have suffered arrest in the course of his observations. His assistantship was a one year appointment and did not entitle him to membership in the faculty.

Mr. Woltman was joint author (with Mr. Wm. L. Nunn, instructor in Economics) of an article entitled "Cossacks" in *The American Mercury*, December, 1928, dealing with the activities of the state police and the coal and iron police. He was a joint author also (with the same collaborator) of an article entitled "Murder by Coal and Iron Police," in the *Nation*, March 20, 1929, on the same subject. In neither article was there anything featuring the connection of the authors with the University of Pittsburgh; both periodicals, in the usual account of their contributors, carried merely the statement that the authors held positions in that University.

During the year 1928-29 Mr. Woltman served as secretary of the Pittsburgh Branch of the Civil Liberties Union, which conducted an aggressive campaign against violence by the coal and iron police and for an investigation of the activities of the Pennsylvania state police. Releases to the press in behalf of the Civil Liberties Union were made over Mr. Woltman's name.

It does not appear that Mr. Woltman had any special connection with the Liberal Club of the University of Pittsburgh, though he was sympathetic toward it and addressed both the Mooney-Billings meeting and also a later meeting after the dissolution of the Club.

In the course of the year Mr. Woltman had been called into numerous conferences with the authorities of the University regarding his activities and the embarrassment caused thereby to the University. It had been his custom to keep notes of these interviews. After the dissolution of the Liberal Club on April 24, 1929, Mr. Woltman issued to the press some or all of these notes, purporting to give the gist of conversations with Executive Secretary J. S. Gow, and Dean L. P. Sieg. They appeared in the *Pittsburgh Press* of April 26, 1929. In these interviews the executive officers were repre-



sented as asserting that the campaign conducted by the Civil Liberties Union was offensive to powerful interests, and association of the University's name with it would therefore jeopardize the appropriation of funds by the state or the securing of endowments from private sources. Dean Sieg was represented as having informed Mr. Woltman that the Governor of the State would probably reduce the University's appropriation as a consequence of the article in the *American Mercury*, and that he might withhold it entirely. The Dean is represented as asserting also that "the Chancellor depends on wealth for financing the Cathedral of Learning and for running the University and he cannot permit anything to happen which might antagonize these wealthy interests or individuals."

On May 1, 1929, Mr. Woltman was asked by Executive Secretary Gow whether he had released his notes to the press. On May 2, he was dismissed, his salary being paid until the end of the year, and he was expelled from the University as a student. Following his dismissal Mr. Woltman gave a statement to the press asserting that no reason had been given for his dismissal and attributing it to his activities for the Civil Liberties Union.

*Findings:* (a) No question of tenure is involved, since Mr. Woltman held a one-year appointment as a graduate assistant, a position in which there is no reasonable expectation of reappointment. He received an entire year's salary, though his services were dispensed with between May 2, 1929, and the close of the academic year.

(b) In respect to academic freedom, there is no question that Mr. Woltman was dismissed without a statement of charges and without a hearing, without any allegation of incompetence for his academic duties, and without recommendation by the department in which these duties were performed.

The authorities of the University have made no public statement dealing with the dismissal of Mr. Woltman from his assistantship. The University's statement relative to the Liberal Club incident referred to his expulsion as a student, grouping him with the two undergraduate students expelled for complicity in that affair and carrying the implication that all were expelled for the same reason. Mr. Woltman asserts, however, that he had never been connected with the Liberal Club, except as a faculty sympathizer, and Dean L. P. Sieg states that the Liberal Club affair was not the reason for his dismissal.

The authorities of the University now take the position, which

they are unwilling to amplify or discuss because of pending litigation, that Mr. Woltman's dismissal was due to defects of character unfitting him both for the position of graduate assistant and for that of graduate student. It is clear that this statement is studiously vague. Apparently it refers to Mr. Woltman's action in releasing to the press his notes of interviews with university authorities. If so, the statement is open to the construction either that the alleged interviews are false, or that Mr. Woltman violated the trust reposed in him by the University authorities in publishing statements of a highly confidential nature. So far as we have ascertained, the University authorities have made no public statement regarding the accuracy or the inaccuracy of Mr. Woltman's report of his conversations with them. We consider it probable that Mr. Woltman's reports are substantially accurate. There is a definite tendency on the part of some of his former colleagues and teachers to criticize him for violation of confidence.

If Mr. Woltman is open to criticism for violation of confidence, it is pertinent, on the other hand, to comment on the astonishing policy of a university officer who would repose confidence of the nature alleged with a view to affecting the public activities of a student or member of the teaching staff. Since we consider the action of the authorities not as a mere indiscretion, but as illustrating a settled policy to restrain public utterances of the faculty by confidential appeals to "cooperate" for the good of the institution, we are unable to draw any other conclusion than that the authorities intended to gain the supposed advantages of repression, without committing themselves to overtly repressive measures.

We are of the opinion that the immediate occasion of Mr. Woltman's dismissal really was the publication of his alleged interviews with university authorities, coming as this action did on top of the Liberal Club incident and as the culmination of a long period of activity on behalf of the Civil Liberties Union, which the University authorities felt to be annoying and dangerous to the financial prospects of the University.

#### GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AT THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

The dissolution of the Liberal Club and the dismissal of Mr. Woltman are the only incidents bearing on academic freedom which, so far, have issued in overt action by the administration. In the

total situation, however, there are other elements which, in our judgment, outweigh these incidents in importance and hold even more sinister possibilities for the future. Accordingly, we shall add a few observations upon the general situation in the University relative to academic freedom, because we regard this as a generating condition from which a series of future evils may arise, unless proper measures are taken to place faculty and administration on a better footing.

It is generally agreed by all the members of the Pittsburgh faculty with whom we have conversed that there exists in the faculty of that institution a wide-spread feeling of insecurity and timidity. Even administrative officers admit that this feeling exists, though they regard it as not justified and attribute it to "hysteria" accompanying the Liberal Club incident. Members of the faculty, however, assert that it is of long standing and was at most merely intensified by occurrences this spring. They state that over a period of several years there has existed the conviction that a teacher must be extremely cautious in taking part in public discussion, especially if his convictions are enlisted on the side of unpopular causes, and that if he does so he jeopardizes his chances of promotion in rank and salary and in the extreme case runs the risk of dismissal. Thus there are allegations that the trouble this year has been accompanied by discrimination in the granting of salary increases to members of the faculty who were prominently concerned.

This feeling of timidity does not extend to utterances before university classes, since it is generally agreed that there is no interference with classroom instruction. It applies rather to public utterances outside the university, and more particularly to the public discussion of controversial, social, and economic questions, such as relations of labor and capital, government regulation of industry, and the domination of government by financial or business interests. It is believed to be particularly dangerous to gain publicity by presenting liberal ideas on such subjects in a manner calculated to secure a popular audience. In respect to controversial questions of this nature the administration of the University is believed to be subject to pressure from interests upon which it is dependent for endowment and appropriations; furthermore, it is believed that the administration is amenable to such pressure in its dealings with the faculty and is not likely to tolerate activities by the faculty which might interfere with the pursuit of funds. Whether this belief is justified

or not, there is not the least doubt that it prevails pretty widely in the faculty of the University of Pittsburgh.

It is, of course, the view of the administration that this sense of insecurity and suspicion is unwarranted, that it is a kind of panic or hysteria for which there is no justification in the action or the intentions of administrative officers. The strongest ground for the administration's view is the fact that, as yet, there has been only one case of dismissal, in which the question of permanence of tenure was not involved, and in which the question of academic freedom was at least complicated by a breach of confidence on the part of the man dismissed. Against this, however, must be set the fact that the administration seems to us to have a nervous dread of unwelcome publicity, to be morbidly fearful lest the name of the University be compromised by public activities of faculty members, and to be prone to construe such activity as motivated by a desire for personal notoriety.

The Chancellor, in conversation with us, denied that it was the policy of the University to discourage members of the teaching staff from taking part in the discussion of public questions. He insisted, however, that the administration did object when such outside activities were undertaken from a desire for publicity or with the purpose of "carrying on propaganda" for some organization outside of the University. In particular, he objected to any form of propaganda that seemed to associate the name of the University with the end sought.

The Chancellor stated that it was his practice, if a member of the faculty seemed persistently to seek publicity, to remonstrate with him in a friendly way. If a man were thus remonstrated with, the purpose would be not to object to the content of his public utterances, but either to point out an adverse effect upon the University's interests of which the man might be unaware, or to object to the desire for notoriety as a motive. If a member of the faculty showed himself unamenable to friendly remonstrance, the Chancellor admitted that he would finally be dismissed. He asserted moreover that at the present time there were four or five members of the faculty to whom this was likely to happen.

After making all possible admissions to the benevolence of the administration's intentions, it is pretty clear that the Chancellor regards faculty tenure as dependent upon his estimate of the personal motives which actuate a man taking a public stand on a contro-

versial question. Since it is only human to believe that an action which is annoying is done from a bad motive, the Chancellor's position does not offer a very secure ground for permanence of tenure. One man's impression of another man's motive is a highly subjective ground for dismissal. It is evident also that "carrying on propaganda" is an equally indefinable ground for dismissal. Any attempt to influence public opinion may, if one chooses, be described as "propaganda." In the last resort, therefore, this charge merely means that a teacher's public utterances have been found to be annoying. Finally, since the administration has already taken the position that a student club can implicate the University by ranging itself on one side of the Mooney-Billings case, it can scarcely be expected to make much distinction between a teacher's civic activities and his function as a university official. We cannot avoid the conclusion that academic freedom at the University of Pittsburgh, particularly the freedom of utterance which a teacher should share with all citizens, is precarious and is held not by right but by grace of the administration.

It is certainly true that the administration prefers to accomplish its purpose tactfully and pacifically; this is shown even in the Woltman case, which ended in dismissal. The possibility of dismissal serves no doubt to make a tactful method more pointed, but the administration certainly wishes to keep the threat in the background. Accordingly, the practice has grown up of calling teachers before administrative officers to explain, in a "friendly interview," their appearance in public addresses or in newspaper articles. Thus it appears to be a settled policy on the part of the Chancellor to call before him any teacher whose public utterances attract attention, in order to point out the possible effect of such publicity upon the interests of the University or to protest against the badness of publicity-seeking as a motive. The Chancellor's policy, very naturally, has spread to the Executive Secretary and to some at least of the deans and heads of departments. The result is that the appearance of a teacher's name in the newspaper is pretty likely to be the signal for an interview of this kind with someone in authority. Sometimes the mere announcement of an intention to speak in public is sufficient to elicit the suggestion that the time is inopportune or the subject is inappropriate.

The plan of such interviews seems to be well standardized: They are confidential and friendly, at least in manner. The appeal is for



cooperation; to do nothing that might jeopardize the university's interests by attracting unfavorable comment. An intention to coerce or to limit freedom of action is carefully disavowed; the friendly intention of the interview is stressed; and the state of the public mind which makes it necessary is deplored. The difficulties which publicity entails for the administration are presented and the teacher's sympathy and support are solicited. If Mr. Woltman's published notes are to be trusted, these interviews sometimes reach an astounding pitch of administrative frankness.

A slightly different kind of interview takes place when an administrative officer feels impelled to ask an explanation of a teacher's action, presumably to find out whether his motives are good or bad, or perhaps to discover incipient revolt in the faculty. If the teacher's motives are found to be good, he is informed that "he has a clean bill of health" and is requested to inform other interested administrators of this decision.

The avowed purpose of this policy of executive interviews is to produce cooperation between the faculty and administration by means of mutual understanding. Its effect is exactly the reverse, for a wide-spread feeling of insecurity and distrust prevails. The reason is evident: Even if the administration's intentions are sincerely friendly, the policy amounts in effect to a humiliating supervision and regulation of faculty conduct—to a tutelage over the public utterances of teachers. The teacher knows that his public appearances will be carefully scanned, that an administrative officer will weigh his motives, and that the administration's estimate of the University's interests will be set against his own judgment of what is right and proper. He knows also that behind the friendliness of the administration there is the threat of dismissal as a last resort. The policy practiced at the University of Pittsburgh amounts in effect to a form of repression in which the show of friendliness is made to do the work of force. That the system is repressive in fact and is intended by the administration to be so, we believe to be unquestionable.

The main reason why really friendly relations between faculty and administration are difficult is that at the University of Pittsburgh such relations are not built upon recognized rights of the faculty either as individuals or as a corporate body. As individuals, all teachers are employed upon yearly contracts, instead of with the presumption of permanence. The legal status of teachers is therefore such as to

foster a sense of insecurity and of dependence upon the favor of administrative officers, while the administration reserves to itself the privilege of getting rid of teachers without being required to assign a reason. As a corporate body the faculty has little or no part in the government of the university. Apparently the faculty rarely even meets, except for routine matters such as voting degrees. Last spring a petition of twenty-two faculty members for a meeting brought no response from the administration before the close of the academic year, and the Executive Secretary is said to have deplored the effect of this formal request upon the Chancellor's temper. The confidential interview with teachers, one by one, has been substituted for general discussion in a faculty meeting which has a recognized right to be informed and consulted upon questions of policy and important acts of administration.

Both in its dealings with individuals and with the faculty as a whole the administration prefers that relations should be personal rather than legal; it desires acquiescence rather than criticism; and it concedes favors rather than rights. Upon such a foundation true friendliness and cooperation cannot be built, for friendship is a relation between equals.

There is no disposition on the part of the faculty at Pittsburgh to deny that the situation of the administration really is difficult. It has adopted a highly ambitious project of expansion, calling for greatly increased endowment; it is dependent for funds partly on the local community and partly on a state government in both of which the influence and peculiar point of view of certain big business and industrial interests seems to be paramount. It is quite possible, therefore, that independence on the part of the administration might cost the University money. We are convinced that this fact, coupled with the determination to carry through its program of rapid development, has induced an attitude of timidity in the administration which is not consistent with a high degree of academic freedom in the University.

So far as this state of affairs depends upon the community in which it is situated, the University is powerless. Nevertheless we believe that certain changes of policy and attitude are within the power of the administration; we believe also that these changes are necessary in the interests of academic freedom:

First, the administration might well be less panic-stricken about the University's name being implicated by the action of an individual

or a group. In respect to the publicity which faculty utterances may attract, the administration needs more courage, more willingness to stand public criticism. It is not certain that such a change of attitude would cause monetary losses; in the end it would unquestionably increase the respect in which the University is held.

Second, in its dealings with individual members of the faculty, while continuing to aim at friendly cooperation as an end, the administration needs to abandon a policy which creates the impression that a teacher's public utterances are subject to surveillance and that a so-called friendly interview is in fact the reprimand of a superior officer. Beyond doubt it would greatly aid in this change if the administration were to abandon the yearly contract and appoint its teachers of higher rank with permanent tenure, subject to removal only for cause shown.

Third, the administration urgently needs to legalize its relation with the faculty as a body. Questions of university policy ought to be subject to discussion and criticism by the faculty as a matter of right, and the faculty's support and approval of such policies should be sought. In short, the government of the University should rest upon the recognized right of the faculty to participate and not upon the friendly intentions of the administration.

GEORGE H. SABINE

CARL WITTKÉ

Proof of the preceding report having been submitted to the chancellor of the University for possible comment, the following statement has been received:

THE UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH  
Office of the Chancellor

November 4, 1929

DEAR PROFESSOR TYLER:

I have your letter of October 23 and the proof of the report for the American Association of University Professors as submitted by Professor George H. Sabine and Professor Carl Wittke. You invite my reply, which is as follows:

First, the prejudice of one member of the committee was evident on his arrival at the University. He seemed eager to express his own views on the issue rather than to find the facts.

Second, I regret the tendency in the article to make insinuations rather than to state facts.

Third, an investigation of a university by the American Association of University Professors places upon the Association an obli-



gation to have its work conducted in fairness and executed in a judicial manner. I do not believe that the investigation was conducted in this way; and I do not consider the effort worthy of the Association.

I am

Faithfully yours,

(Signed) JOHN G. BOWMAN, Chancellor of the University

The above report is approved by the general committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure for publication in the *Bulletin*.

## REVIEWS

COLLEGE ATHLETICS,<sup>1</sup> "BULLETIN 23."—Within the last few days the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has released the long-awaited study of American college athletics which has been in active prosecution for nearly four years past. It represents the work of Dr. Howard J. Savage, a staff member of the Foundation, who was the author of an earlier bulletin dealing with conditions in the same field, in Great Britain. Associated with Dr. Savage were Harold W. Bentley, John T. McGovern, and Dean F. Smiley, whose names appear as co-authors. In addition, certain special fields of investigation have been carefully canvassed and such well-known figures in the field of science as Francis G. Benedict, E. V. McCollum, and Livingston Farrand, together with Dr. Raycroft, Professor of Hygiene of Princeton, and Dr. Richards, Chief Surgeon of the Harvard Athletic Association, have served as advisors and consultants. Every effort has been made in the study to consider all possible aspects of American college athletics, and a perusal of the contents of Bulletin 23 attests both to the care of the study, its comprehensive character, and the judicious and conservative interpretation of the vast mass of data secured.

Such topics as commercialism, neglect of educational opportunity, amateur status, recruiting and subsidizing, hygiene of training, the relation of athletics to scholarship, the influence on moral and social traits, various aspects of the coaching problem, the influence of athletic conferences, and the question of athletics in the secondary schools, are among the major questions which are considered in detail. In addition, a large number of other questions, intramural, intercollegiate, and even international, in character find more than casual mention in this extensive review.

While recognizing the many defects in the present system, the tone of the entire volume is one of a constructive optimism. There has been no attempt at sensationalism, no pandering to that common human taste which found its expression in "muckraking" in the so-called "gay nineties," and in the political campaign literature of various sport-governing bodies of the later decades. The conditions disclosed on these pages have long been known as facts to every individual who has come in contact with college sport in this country. It is safe to say that Dr. Savage and his associates have

<sup>1</sup> Extracts from the *Bulletin* are printed on pages 607-616

not used one-tenth of the material at their disposal. Every statement which they offer is completely and authoritatively documented, and it is the best possible earnest of the sincerity of their desire to deal only constructively with the situation that they have omitted much spectacular matter to which they undoubtedly had access.

So much in a general way concerning the body of the report. Commercialism, either as a means to an end or as the principal objective, would seem to lie at the root of many of the principal abuses. With the steadily growing interest of the general public college athletics today has become "big business," and what should be sport pursued for recreation and pleasure is now an activity subordinated to a wide variety of unworthy interests. The publicity value of college athletics has been recognized by many governing bodies, and much money spent to promote an increase in advertising value. The clamor of alumni for winning teams, emphasizing the chief defect of our American quality, has played and still plays its very powerful rôle in the prostitution of sport. The large financial returns with increased opportunities for development, not merely along athletic lines, has on the one hand obscured the moral vision of college governing bodies, and on the other led to a development of certain forms of parasitism. The desire to control these large sums of money has engendered bitter and acrimonious conflict. To attain the coveted goal of athletic success and thus secure all of its material benefits, practices have been followed which inevitably have produced misrepresentation, falsification, hypocrisy, dishonesty, and a tampering with standards that has reacted most subversively on both the active and the passive agents.

All of these things are true. They are known both generally and in unpleasant detail to everyone who has had any contact with American college athletics as they are prosecuted today. And yet with all of these drawbacks, abuses, dishonesties, and frank prostitutions, the outlook for the future is fundamentally a hopeful one. In the first place, athletics properly conducted and supervised, pursued for their real purpose, which is that of healthful recreation, are too fine, too real, too vital a part of the average man's life to be eliminated without an irreparable loss.

That the abuses cannot be corrected by legislation is patent. Our organizations, be they small or large, have drafted statute after statute to correct or at least minimize some one of the present evils. And the ink is not dry on the first draft of the rule before a dozen

methods for evading its spirit while complying with its letter have been formulated. It is by education and by education alone that men may be brought to the point where they will voluntarily abjure the practices which today are discussed in pages of the *Bulletin*. To illustrate, no legislation that can be drafted can possibly prevent the wealthy alumnus or instructed representative of a college faculty from placing in the hands of the parents of a promising schoolboy athlete the funds that will send this boy to a given institution. There is but one way to stop the evil, and that lies in the education of the individual to the point where he will refrain from his wholly undetectable violation of the canons of common honesty and decency in sport because of his own ethical reactions. In the education of the general public, and by that is meant the general collegiate public, Bulletin 23 stands as the primer, the starting point of an educational campaign which if followed consistently, sincerely, and above all patiently, will in due course of time stamp out the abuses which today constitute so dark a stain on the cleanliness of American college athletics.

Such a campaign, such an educational program, is not only necessary with the older group but it is even more essential with the boys in schools and the lads in colleges. The writer of this review has been actively concerned with college athletics as a participator and administrator for over three decades. One of the most striking and disquieting features of the present status of affairs lies in the changed attitude of the young men in the competing group. Years ago there were tramp athletes, there were professionals masquerading as amateurs, there were, in short, all of the abuses with which we are now called upon to contend. But the attitude of the transgressors in the competing group was a different one. They were out-laws and they regarded themselves as such. They were breaking laws, the justice and wisdom of which they did not question. That they offended against these laws was true, but they did so because they chose, knowing it to be wrong and without moral self-justification.

Today, the student psychology both of the competitor and of his non-active college mate has undergone a subtle but fundamental change. They are loud in self-justification, they are doing the "common sense, practical" thing, there is no moral or ethical reason why they should not be dishonest, why they should not exploit their college for personal gain, why they should not regard the playing

rules drafted for the safeguarding of the sport as a set of obsolete conventions to be evaded where possible by the practically minded and intelligent athlete. It is a common thing today to hear an undergraduate say, "Why shouldn't so-and-so earn a little easy money on the side if he can? Think of the money that he brings in to the institution. In simple justice he ought to have his share and the rules that prevent it should be done away with." The moral blind-spot has grown until with many of our undergraduates today it has obscured if not obliterated normal vision. It is with this group that the need for education is greatest, for they are not only the active participants of today but the alumni and faculty members of tomorrow. The sight of a schoolboy "shopping" his athletic wares in the athletic market-place, frequently guided and instructed by an interested parent, is not an elevating spectacle. This group with their older brothers in college forms the point of first approach in the educational program from which, and only from which, we may expect salvation.

In the fluttering of the hit birds with which the newspapers have been filled since the release of Bulletin 23, a large number of mis-statements have naturally found place. Appeals to national prejudice, implication of superficiality in the study, flat denial of authenticated fact, with a touch here and there of more skillful and thus more dangerous suggestion, have been numerous. This is natural as it is an entrenched position which is assailed. The real harm comes in the reading by the great mass of the uninformed public who will accept such statements as endowed with the same authority as that implicit in the Bulletin. Many readers of today will be frankly antagonistic, others indifferent, but there will be the few who will read and perhaps for the first time learn that all is not well. There are a lot of honest people in the world, and some of them in spite of this attribute have attained positions of power and influence in the community. That an individual of this caliber here and there may be influenced to play a positive rôle rather than the passive one of negation, is to be hoped. There is a leaven in Bulletin 23 and it will surely find something in the mass on which to work. Results cannot be anticipated tomorrow nor even next year. But there is a biological progression and with an educational force at work which will inculcate cleaner and finer ideals—the true realization of the healthy mind in the healthy body—one may confidently look forward to the time when the old order will be changed.

Every sincere lover of sport, every man concerned with the maintenance of moral welfare in the youth of this country owes a personal debt of gratitude to Dr. Savage, to his co-workers, and to the Foundation which has made this study possible. Many years ago, in the early days of this great organization, an educational study was carried out which has changed profoundly the whole field of training in the field of medicine. That the results have been beneficial to the community at large, no fair-minded man can deny. Today the health of the citizen is the better safeguarded and protected because of the pioneer work of this institution. What these earlier studies have done for the health of the body it must be hoped the present work will do for one aspect at least of the health of the spirit. And as the simple rules of clean sportsmanship, followed in the spirit as in the letter form a safe chart by which to sail life's course, so this study in which the emphasis implicitly is laid upon them may have an even greater influence on our spiritual health as a nation than its immediate thesis would seem to contain.

ALLAN W. ROWE

CHARLES W. ELIOT, *THE MAN AND HIS BELIEFS*, edited by William Allan Neilson, *Harper's*, 1926. The papers which comprise the two large volumes so handsomely provided by *Harper's* were approved for posthumous publication by Dr. Eliot himself, and hence may be justly regarded as an authoritative summary of the great educator's doctrine and also as that portion of his voluminous literary work by which he would choose to be remembered. Its scope is indicative of the far-flung intellectual interest of Eliot. His was no compartmental mind; he was an educationist in no restricted or professional sense. He was far from feeling an academic disdain for current affairs, for the welfare of the state, for the social well-being of the community in which he lived. By training a scientist, Dr. Eliot was at least as interested in the humanities as in "natural philosophy." He consistently upheld the claims of literature and the other arts to the attention of all who would attain the full and rich life. He preserved a happy balance between the claims of the intellect and the claims of character, supposing the proper aim of a liberal education to be neither the moral and religious provincialism of the sectarian college nor the sterile "emancipation" and intellectual snobbishness sometimes the products elsewhere. And it may finally be said that his distinction as a college president was due in large measure to the re-



markable degree in which he combined the educational theorist and the administrator. There are plenty of statistics in Dr. Eliot's addresses, and there is evidence of New England shrewdness. The ultimacy of the Corporation is never forgotten; that culture rests inevitably upon an economic basis is always in remembrance. But Dr. Eliot was happily free from that modern administrative state of mind to which numbers seem all-important: he was not of those who regard "biggest" as synonymous with "best."

All in all, the word by which one could best characterize the mind of Eliot would be *balanced*. He sought to do justice to all the factors of an increasingly complex world. And to a memorable degree he succeeded. The present volumes represent his interests under five headings: Education, Capital and Labor, War and Peace, The Conduct of Life, and Government. The essays included under them range from "The Future of Trades Unionism in a Democracy," "Successful Profit Sharing," and "An International Force Must Support an International Tribunal" to "The Appreciation of Beauty," "The Intellectual Life of Women," "Public Opinion and Sex Hygiene," and "The Religion of the Future."

President Neilson contributes to the volumes a Biographical Study which, though disappointingly brief, gives a well-balanced summary of Dr. Eliot's interests and activities. Particularly useful is the account of the rise of the Harvard graduate schools. When Eliot came to the University, the Medical School made no entrance requirement beyond the payment of a fee, with the result that many of the candidates were barely literate. "The whole period of attendance required was three winter terms of four months each, and the diploma was granted after a short oral examination in which it was sufficient to pass in five out of nine subjects—all of which were really indispensable." Dr. Eliot took affairs in vigorous hand: he proposed lengthening the terms from four to nine months, making the courses progressive in arrangement, substituting written for oral examinations; the changes were put through by the governing boards in spite of the resistance of the medical faculty. "It took many years before the school was put upon a real graduate basis, insuring students with a good general education, and before the lengthened course and the clinical and laboratory training were required which are now taken for granted in any good medical school." The situation of the other professional schools was analogous. The Law School had no dean and but three professors. The first Dean, C. C. Langdell, was of Dr. Eliot's choos-

ing; and it was Dr. Eliot who supported him in the introduction of the famous "case system." In course of time this school also came to require a college degree for entrance.

One of the essays printed under "Education" concerns "The Evils of College Football," and the brief paragraph Dr. Neilson devotes to the topic in his "Study" is worth quoting. Of Dr. Eliot he writes:

"His attitude toward football is characteristic. He was an enthusiast for bodily health, and for regular and rational exercise as a means to maintain health. He himself rowed on a college crew when he was a tutor; he rode horseback, bicycled, sailed a boat, swam, and walked. He believed in college athletics as a means to an end; he did not believe in colleges as a means to intercollegiate contests. . . . So, although nothing seemed to evoke college loyalty so much as a football game with Yale, and though many of his friends and hundreds of loyal and generous alumni were devoted to the game, he did not hesitate to say what he thought about it."

It is time now to turn to the 239 pages devoted to Dr. Eliot's essays and addresses on educational topics. A reviewer in the *Times Literary Supplement* laments the absence from the section of any representation from "the long list of annual reports to the Harvard Overseers—almost deserving the title of 'State papers' on education—by means of which Dr. Eliot exerted so large an influence on the development of higher education in America, outside his own university." But we do have the masterly inaugural address of 1869, in which Eliot enunciated substantially the principles upon which he was to operate through the forty years of his presidency. He defends the elective system: it "fosters scholarship, because it gives free play to natural preferences and inborn aptitudes, makes possible enthusiasm for a chosen work, relieves the professor and the ardent disciple of the presence of a body of students who are compelled to an unwelcome task, and enlarges instruction by substituting many and various lessons given to small, lively classes, for a few lessons many times repeated to different sections of a numerous class." He advocates the substitution, as far as practicable, of the lecture for the recitation. He stresses the democracy of Harvard: "no good student need ever stay away from Cambridge or leave college simply because he is poor. . . . The poorest and the richest students are equally welcome here, provided that with their poverty or their wealth they bring capacity, ambition, and purity." One later emphasis is missing:



that on faculty "research." Dr. Eliot gives a somewhat depressing account of the faculty's condition. "It is very hard," he says, "to find competent professors for the University. Very few Americans of eminent ability are attracted to this profession. (This charge is still made.) The pay has been too low, and there has been no gradual rise out of drudgery, such as may reasonably be expected in other learned callings. He points out that "With the exception of the endowments of the Observatory, the University does not hold a single fund primarily intended to secure to men of learning the leisure and means to prosecute original researches." While in spite of difficulties "the strongest and most devoted professors will contribute something to the patrimony of knowledge," "the prime business of American professors in this generation must be regular and assiduous class teaching."

The succeeding essays vary greatly in importance. The most significant are the development of some one of Dr. Eliot's educational methods or theses. *What is a Liberal Education?* is a substantial paper pleading for the abandonment of the old humanistic education—the "classical" curriculum of Latin, Greek, and Mathematics which had for three hundred years been prerequisite to the baccalaureate in arts—and the substitution for it of a modern program which should rate the serious pursuit of one study, whatever it might be, as equipollent with the serious pursuit of another. Dr. Eliot did not believe in a hierarchy of studies; his democracy extended even to the curriculum. After an interesting historical introduction, pointing out that the same conservative objections to the new curriculum were made in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries when the "new" classical studies were displaying the "old" studies in scholastic metaphysics and theology, Dr. Eliot advances successive (and perhaps we may say also *successful*) defenses of English literature (which, in 1884, was said not to hold equal rank with Greek and Latin in "the number and rank of the teachers, or in the consideration in which the subject is held by faculty and students! . . ."), French and German, history (in 1884, "The great majority of American colleges . . . make no requirements in history for admission, and have no teacher of history whatever." Dartmouth had *no* teacher of history), political economy, and natural science. The concluding section of this masterly document answers objections to this liberalized curriculum. To the charge that the change removes all definite character from the B.A., Eliot makes the apt reply that "the most significant and valuable degree in arts which

is anywhere given—the German degree of Doctor of Philosophy and Master of Arts—does not stand for any particular studies . . .”; and to the charge that putting other studies on an academic par with the classics will mean the end of Latin and Greek, he proposes a telling *ad hominem*: “The higher the value which one sets on Greek and Latin as means of culture, the firmer must be his belief in the permanence of those studies when they cease to be artificially protected.”

In *The Aims of the Higher Education*, Dr. Eliot finds opportunity for development of a topic dear to him—the importance of research to the university. “The University seeks new truth. A university is a society of learned men, each a master in his field; each acquainted with what has been achieved in all past time in his special subject; each prepared to push forward a little the present limits of knowledge; each expecting and hoping to clear up some tangle or bog on the frontier, or to pierce, with his own little search-light, if only by a hand’s-breadth, the mysterious gloom which surrounds on every side the area of ascertainable truth.” He paints an interesting portrait of the typical investigator who is “wholly indifferent to notoriety,” who “would indeed like to have his name favorably known, not to millions of people, but to five or six students of the Latin dative case, or of the Greek particle *av*, or of fossil beetles, or of metisrites, or of starfish.” The mention of these variegated Specialties recalls Pope’s satire of pedants and *virtuosi* in the *Dunciad*. But Dr. Eliot was not satirical in his portrait. He was a firm believer in specialization in general, and of academic specialization in particular. The emphasis on “research” in the contemporary American university owes much, for better or for worse, to Dr. Eliot.

The educational method with which Eliot’s name has been most closely connected is the “elective system,” to which an essay in the present collection is devoted. Dr. Neilson reminds us that Eliot did not invent the system: “It was almost universal in Europe, and it began to be introduced at Harvard as early as 1825.” But Dr. Eliot was the principal American advocate of what was called “free election”—that is, election without restrictions. Dr. Eliot was aware of the criticisms of the method, and spends considerable time in considered reply. “An elective system,” he points out, “does not mean liberty to do nothing. It allows every student to choose his subjects of study; but the amount of his work remains prescribed, and its quality is tested by means of periodical examinations, essays. . . .” “It is one of the real advantages of the elective system that the intelligent,

self-directing, responsible student can have all the advantages of freedom, while the irresponsible, thoughtless, or lazy student can be made to do some work, without driving him into studies for which he has not capacity and in which he feels no interest." Students do not choose so unwisely as a critic might suppose. "Inconsecutive or aimless selections are hard to find." Of course the principal argument for the elective system is the psychological truth that "Any human being . . . will always work harder and accomplish more in a task which interests him" and this suggestion Dr. Eliot connects up in a significant way the elective system for the students and specialization and research for the professors. He points out that "While college curricula were prescribed, and therefore dealt almost entirely with the elements of the subject taught, there was little in the work of a college teacher which stimulated him to broad and deep intellectual attainments. His college work became an absolute routine. . . . He seldom became an advanced student or investigator. . . ." Under the elective system, all this is changed. "Even the younger teachers have received each a competent training in some specialty, which the assistant professor and professors are always chosen from men who have demonstrated their capacity for persistent, productive, scholarly work."

The modern view of education as set forth by Dr. Eliot still persists. Its objectives were, in the main, his objectives. As he did perhaps more than any other man to break down the old ideals of the classical course and the "general" cultural training, so he did more than any other man to establish the substitutionary ideal of the equipollence of studies and the unlimited scope of professional specialization. There are still those who find greater soundness in the older ideal—who revolt against specialization and professionism and research. But all can do justice to the dignity and earnestness and fullness with which Dr. Eliot set forth his views. His addresses and essays are classical documents for the study of the point of view that produced our modern universities.

AUSTIN WARREN

LEARNING AND LEADERSHIP, by Alfred Zimmern, Oxford University Press, 1928, pp. 1-111.—It has been stated that "Mr. Zimmern's main business as a publicist is to vindicate the place and competence of the scholar in public life." From that point of view *Learning and Leadership* is a challenge to every college and uni-

versity teacher. As a long-time student of Greek life and thought, he projects his ideas against the background of a civilization which had as its ideal, intellectual leadership for the service of the community. As Director of the Geneva School of International Studies and Deputy Director of the League of Nations Institute of Intellectual Cooperation, he makes the crowning achievement and goal of training for leaders, international cooperation in all fields of intellectual activity. As an advocate of a new world order, he outlines the synthesis which he thinks essential if civilization is to be saved for mankind.

In epitome the following may be presented as a fair statement of his thesis:

"Civilization is control over environment. A civilized man is a man who understands the world in which he is living and the forces by which it is moved, whilst a savage is a plaything of arbitrary and capricious powers, acting beyond the limited range of his intelligence. . . . If there is one clear deduction to be drawn from the events of the last few years, it is that statesmanship has not yet recovered the control which it finally relinquished in 1914 over the fluid and tumultuous interaction of human wills and passions which we like to describe fatalistically as 'events'. . . . The survival of civilization depends on the collaboration between Learning and Leadership. But the immediate task of the moment is to evoke such leadership from the ranks of learning itself."

Mr. Zimmern characterizes the new environment over which civilization has lost control in three main respects: the enlargement of the scale of public affairs, the increase of complexity in civilization, and—most disconcerting of all to him—the rapidity of the reactions of the post-war world. The recovery of control over "events" is not, he thinks, through invention or discovery but through adjustment. To this end the problem is one of international intellectual cooperation. Especially interesting to the student and teacher is his outline of the seven stages of public education for leaders, ranging from the pre-school age to the post-university period of scientific research into the cause of international disorders. Knowing the limitations of our public school system and teachers, such a reader will regard as quite Utopian the suggestions that a much needed improvement is the international exchange of primary teachers and that "it should become a recognized practice among educational administrations that every primary school teacher should spend a

year in a foreign country before he or she has reached the age of thirty."

His heaviest indictment because of the present sorry state of civilization is against science. She "has changed the life and habits of mankind and created an interdependent world society." But "she has lost control over the results of her own thinking. Content to add knowledge to knowledge, she hands on her discoveries to others to make of them what they will. . . . If the art of war has been brought to a point where it seems destined, unless checked by higher forces, to destroy both itself and civilization through the perfecting of its powers of offense, it is Science, and Science alone, which is responsible. But science has never accepted the responsibility. She knows nothing of ends. She is concerned only with means." "The schism that has resulted from the rise of modern science must be healed" through a program of international intellectual cooperation.

From the point of view of clarity, distinction, and even beauty of expression, this essay should make a general appeal because of its literary charm. Here a few illustrations must suffice. The properly trained university man, he says, will have a knowledge of how to read and how to travel.

"Reading, once the privilege of the few, seems almost in danger of becoming one of the lost arts. Men read grossly and inordinately bringing to the printed page the same kind of indiscriminate appetite that the glutton or the drunkard brings to the pleasures of the table. Ask them to describe or analyze what they have read and they will too often be unable to do so. For their object in reading is not to understand what is in the book but to escape from themselves. Reading has, in fact, in our nerve-racked and industrialized society, become for millions little more than a narcotic.

"For such a demand it was necessary to provide a supply, and it has not been wanting. Its most characteristic product is the novel of the railway bookstall and the circulating library; but, in varying degrees in different countries, the newspaper also ministers to this craving for sensation."

"The grave international problem created by the maladjustment of the tourist to the countries through which he is transported has been unduly neglected. Yet the disorders set up, social and moral, no less than economic, by the presence of these migrants, conveyed around, ignorant of the language, laws, and customs, of the country,



under conditions which insulate them from their environment in a kind of peripatetic hermitage, are becoming too serious to be ignored. "Travellers' tales," which used to be instructive treatises or agreeable romances, are now too often synonymous with ill-natured gossip based on an experience with a hotel bill or a dispute over a window in a carriage. One of the grossest fallacies current in the nineteenth century was that international understanding would be promoted automatically by the multiplication of individual contacts. Great journeys and little minds go ill together."

He stresses the importance of intellectual leaders in times of crises thus: "In the never-ceasing struggle between force and intelligence, between command and persuasion, the doers and the thinkers, the doers have won the pitched battles but the thinkers have won the campaigns." His appeal for an adequate compensation for the scholar and artist might well be graven on a tablet within every university:

"A scholar without a private library, an artist within bare walls, a musician too poor to afford a good instrument, are divested of part of their personality. These things for the intellectual are not merely instruments but symbols: they are part of the communion of the saints to which his life is dedicated: they maintain and nourish his living relationship with the masters of his world—not those earthly masters from whom he receives his monthly or yearly pay and his patent of appointment, but those kings of the invisible world to whom he swore fealty when he chose his vocation."

Finally ponder over his expression of the present state of mankind:

"Civilization, in the true spiritual sense of the term, has ceased to exist. And even its outward semblance, the proud and imposing apparatus of wealth and material power, exists only on sufferance. It has been granted a reprieve until the next war—that war for which Science is preparing and which statesmen are powerless to arrest."

All in all, this book, because of its clear analysis, its indictment of the scholar who works without considering his responsibility to humanity, its challenge to leadership, and its suggestions for the recovery of a world civilization, is one which might well be the basis for discussion in local chapters of this Association.

GEORGE R. COFFMAN

THE CHOICE OF AN OCCUPATION, Yale University, Department of Personnel Study, A. B. Crawford, Director.—There has been

a growing demand, in recent years, for vocational information to meet the needs of college students. Within the past year the American Council on Education has fostered the publication of several vocational monographs. At Stanford, Harvard, and other Universities, attempts have been made to compile vocational information in a form usable by students who want to know what occupations to choose. The new booklet from Yale is of the same general character, but differs from other experiments in being dominated by what has come to be called "the personnel point of view."

"The majority of the occupational articles contained in this booklet were prepared by Mr. Stuart H. Clement of the Department of Personnel Study. Professor Edward S. Noyes and Mr. John C. Diller, also of the Department, as well as other University officers, have assisted in the preparation of this material. . . . The editors realize that in its present form this booklet is far from complete, but they feel that the collection of data about numerous additional callings, not yet included herein, may be facilitated by publication without further delay of the articles already prepared. If the latter appear helpful so far as they go, they can then serve as samples of the general type of discussion concerning other fields as well, which the Department expects to develop in a revised and amplified edition of this work."

The booklet consists of two main parts: first, a general discussion of the business of choosing an occupation (pp. 7-33), and, secondly, a series of informative articles on some thirty-five occupations. These represent in turn the older professions, science and engineering, and the field of business.

The introductory part of the work is dominated by a practical personnel point of view. There is no mistaking the intention of the author to address the student directly. It contains a great deal of specific advice and admonition, and offers interesting sidelights on the business of finding a job. Most of the discussion is undoubtedly wholesome and suited to the average undergraduate. One misses, however, a note of encouragement for the superior individual, the man who "makes his own job." The business of placing graduates in industry, which so largely occupies some of our personnel workers, needs to be guarded against mechanization. The "personnel point of view," at its best, would require that each individual be placed in the kind of work that best suits his capacities, and in which he may find his best opportunity for growth and

advancement. It is the opinion of this reviewer that graduates of the superior type would get little profit out of these introductory disquisitions. Anybody, however, could benefit by a reading of the occupational descriptions that follow.

In presenting each occupation an attempt is made to show what activities it involves, what opportunities for specialization occur within the field, what preparation is required, what special qualifications are desirable, and what rewards and satisfaction the occupation has to offer. Following each occupational discussion there is a list of references for further reading, very well chosen. No fixed routine is followed in these presentations, but only a general pattern. It is better so. The articles, of course, are not of equal merit. Some are very clear and definite, but others are a bit vague on essential points. On the whole, this is without doubt the most useful work of its kind so far produced. It will be improved, and it will inspire the publication of many more books on the vocations, required to meet a constantly growing demand.

The *liaison* now being effected by our personnel departments between the educational and industrial worlds deserves the close attention of faculty men. This business needs control and regulation; it should engage educators of the highest order of ability. The movement cannot be suppressed. It is spontaneous and natural. But it can be managed wisely in the best interests of the college and of the community.

D. T. HOWARD



## EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

EXTRACTS FROM REPORT OF THE CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR THE  
ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING ON AMERICAN COLLEGE ATHLETICS.<sup>1</sup>—

*Preface.*— . . Nothing in the educational régime of our higher institutions perplexes the European visitor so much as the rôle that organized athletics plays. . . .

When the visitor from the European university has pondered the matter, he comes to his American university colleagues with two questions:

"What relation has this astonishing athletic display to the work of an intellectual agency like a university?"

"How do students, devoted to study, find either the time or the money to stage so costly a performance?"

This study undertakes to answer these questions, not for the foreigner so much as for thoughtful Americans both in and out of the university. . . . The study relates to colleges in the Dominion of Canada as well as to those in the United States. The question is whether an institution in the social order whose primary purpose is the development of the intellectual life can at the same time serve as an agency to promote business, industry, journalism, salesmanship, and organized athletics on an extensive commercial basis. The question is not so much whether athletics in their present form should be fostered by the university, but how fully can a university that fosters professional athletics discharge its primary function. It is true the athletes belong (in recent years) to the college half of the university. Now and again one hears from the graduate school side of the university a protest against the all-absorbing glamour of the athlete, and from the college side a complaint that the graduate students lack college "patriotism." But the fact remains that the same administration that is seeking to promote scholarship and research in the graduate school is responsible for the stadiums, the paid coach, and the gate receipts in the college.

How far can an agency, whose function is intellectual, go in the development of other causes without danger to its primary purpose? Can a university teach equally well philosophy and salesmanship? Can it both sponsor genuine education and at the same time train raw recruits for minor vocations? Can it concentrate its attention

<sup>1</sup> See Review of the *Bulletin*, page 592. Copies of *Bulletins*—Eighteen, Games and Sports in British Schools and Universities; Twenty-three, College Athletics; Twenty-four, Literature of American School and College Athletics; will be furnished members upon request to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

on securing teams that win, without impairing the sincerity and vigor of its intellectual purpose? It is to these questions that the thoughtful man is finally led if he seeks to reconcile the divergent activities of the present-day American university. The matter of athletics is only one feature in the picture, but a significant one. . . .

The independent college has not wholly escaped the tendencies of the time. Some of them have been drawn into the well-nigh universal passion to exploit athletics and to offer courses in journalism or business or salesmanship. But the group of strong, independent colleges, whose standing is acknowledged among college men, represents today our most consistent exponent of higher education according to an ideal of intellectual culture which has grown out of our own racial history, national experience, and intellectual striving. . . .

Perhaps no more stimulating demonstration could be offered today to higher education in our country than that of a university devoted to the pure intellectual ideal *sans* athletics, schools of business, of salesmanship, and of other commercial vocations. . . . The preceding pages have dealt with a complicated situation of which organized athletics are but one factor. It remains to summarize the particular defects and excesses of present-day athletic contests as set forth in detail in the chapters of this report. The game of football looms large in any account of the growth of professionalism in college games. This does not mean that other sports are untouched by the influences that have converted football into a professional vocation.

The unfavorable results upon students through the athletic development may be briefly stated in the following terms:

1. The extreme development of competitive games in the colleges has reacted upon the secondary schools. The college athlete begins his athletic career before he gets to college.
2. Once in college the student who goes in for competitive sports, and in particular for football, finds himself under a pressure, hard to resist to give his whole time and thought to his athletic career. No college boy training for a major team can have much time for thought or study.
3. The college athlete, often a boy from a modest home, finds himself suddenly a most important man in the college life. He begins to live on a scale never before imagined. A special table is provided. Sport clothes and expensive trips are furnished him out of the athletic chest. He jumps at one bound to a plane of living

of which he never before knew, all at the expense of some fund of which he knows little. When he drops back to a scale of living such as his own means can afford, the result is sometimes disastrous.

4. He works (for it is work, not play) under paid professional coaches whose business it is to develop the boy to be an effective unit in a team. The coach of today is no doubt a more cultivated man than the coach of twenty years ago. But any father who has listened to the professional coaching a college team will have some misgivings as to the cultural value of the process.

5. Inter-college athletics are highly competitive. Every college or university longs for a winning team in its group. The coach is on the alert to bring the most promising athletes in the secondary schools to his college team. A system of recruiting and subsidizing has grown up, under which boys are offered pecuniary and other inducements to enter a particular college. The system is demoralizing and corrupt, alike for the boy who takes the money and for the agent who arranges it, and for the whole group of college and secondary school boys who know about it.

6. Much discussion has been had as to the part the college graduate should have in the government of his college. In the matter of competitive athletics the college alumnus has, in the main, played a sorry rôle. It is one thing for an "old grad" to go back and coach the boys of his college as at Oxford or Cambridge, where there are no professional coaches and no gate receipts. It is quite another thing for an American college graduate to pay money to high school boys, either directly or indirectly, in order to enlist their services for a college team. The process is not only unsportsmanlike, it is immoral to the last degree. The great body of college graduates are wholly innocent in this matter. Most college men wish their college to win. Those who seek to compass that end by recruiting and subsidizing constitute a small, but active, minority, working oftentimes without the knowledge of the college authorities. This constitutes the most disgraceful phase of recent inter-college athletics.

7. The relation of organized sports to the health of college students is not a simple question. The information to deal with it completely is not yet at hand. A chapter of the report is devoted to this subject. In general it may be said that the relation of college organized sports to the health of the individual students is one dependent on the good sense exhibited by the college boy in partici-

pating in such sports, and to the quality of the advice he receives from the college medical officer.

8. For many games the strict organization and the tendency to commercialize the sport has taken the joy out of the game. In football, for example, great numbers of boys do not play football, as in English schools and colleges, for the fun of it. A few play intensely. The great body of students are onlookers.

9. Finally, it is to be said that the blaze of publicity in which the college athlete lives is a demoralizing influence for the boy himself and no less so for the college. . . .

The American daily, or weekly paper lives on its advertising, not on the subscriptions paid by its readers. The news policy of the paper is determined by this fundamental fact. . . .

This has led to a form of personal news-telling unknown in any other country. In no other nation of the world will a college boy find his photograph in the metropolitan paper because he plays on a college team. All this is part of the newspaper effort to reach the advertiser. The situation is regrettable alike for journalism and for the public good. But it exists.

Into this game of publicity the university of the present day enters eagerly. It desires for itself the publicity that the newspapers can supply. It wants students, it wants popularity, but above all it wants money and always more money. . . .

And so it happens that the athlete lives in the white light of publicity and his photograph adorns the front pages of metropolitan (which means New York, Boston, Chicago, San Francisco, Los Angeles, New Orleans, and a hundred other) dailies. It must be an unusual boy who can keep his perspective under such circumstances. Why should the college boy be subjected to this régime merely to enable some thousands of attractive young reporters to make a living? . . .

But no nation can afford in its educational system to forget that to the great mass of mankind an honest job, performed in good spirit, is the road to moral soundness and to social contentment. . . .

The thoughtful reader who has become aware of the transformation of college sports into professional athletic contests directed by paid coaches will wish to have answers to two questions.

Who is responsible for the athletic transformation? and what is now to be done about it? . . .

It is a useless enquiry at this day to ask who were responsible for

the development in the colleges of commercialized sports. The tendencies of the time, the growing luxury, the keen inter-college competition, the influence of well-meaning, but unwise, alumni, the acquiescence in newspaper publicity, the reluctance of the authorities of the university or the college to take an unpopular stand—all these have played their part.

But there can be no doubt as to where lies the responsibility to correct this situation. The defense of the intellectual integrity of the college and of the university lies with the president and faculty. With them lies also the authority. The educational governance of the university has always been in their hands. There have been cases in the past quarter century when a politically minded governing board, or an excited group of alumni, has sought to override the decision of the faculty in such matters. Such incidents today are rare though not entirely unknown. The president and faculty have in their power the decision touching matters affecting the educational policy and the intellectual interests of their institution. If commercialized athletics do not affect the educational quality of an institution, nothing does. The responsibility to bring athletics into a sincere relation to the intellectual life of the college rests squarely on the shoulders of the president and faculty.

What ought to be done?

The paid coach, the gate receipts, the special training tables, the costly sweaters and extensive journeys in special Pullman cars, the recruiting from the high school, the demoralizing publicity showered on the players, the devotion of an undue proportion of time to training, the devices for putting a desirable athlete, but a weak scholar, across the hurdles of the examinations—these ought to stop and the intercollege and intramural sports be brought back to a stage in which they can be enjoyed by large numbers of students and where they do not involve an expenditure of time and money wholly at variance with any ideal of honest study. Extensive statistics have been gathered as to the comparison between the college performance of those taking part in inter-college contests with that of students who take no part in athletics. Some of these tabulations are given in this report. They mean little. When the intellectual life of a body of college students is on a low plane, the difference between the formal credits of men in training for inter-college contests and those of the ordinary student who is not in training, may be inappreciable. But it requires no tabulation of statistics to prove that



the young athlete who gives himself for months, body and soul, to training under a professional coach for a gruelling contest, staged to focus the attention of thousands of people, and upon which many thousands of dollars will be staked, will find no time or energy for any serious intellectual effort. The compromises that have to be made to keep such students in the college and to pass them through to a degree give an air of insincerity to the whole university-college régime. We cannot serve every cause—scholarship, science, business, salesmanship, organized athletics—through the university.

*Values in American College Athletics.*— . . . As for American college athletics, their improvement during the past thirty years has been marked. Let that improvement continue—let their physical, moral, and spiritual potentialities in the education of youth be clearly understood and sincerely acted upon, and their value in our national life will be immeasurably enhanced.

In the meantime, certain features of college and university athletics must be weighed: their educational bearings, the amateur status, and the interest of the public. . . .

Chapter VII shows that the effects of athletics and athletic exercise upon the bodily condition and growth of undergraduates, in spite of some conditions that call for obvious improvement, are in the main beneficial. Both young men and young women who participate in intramural and intercollegiate athletics improve their health in a way that can be measured in anthropometric terms. College athletics have upon the nation a direct physical effect that justifies not alone their continuance but also their encouragement and further development, especially in their intramural phases. . . .

In the past, popular reasoning has run somewhat in this way: College athletics, especially football, and other body-contact games, *inculcate* in participants such desirable qualities as courage, perseverance, initiative, uprightness, cooperation, and honesty. Thereby they contribute very essentially to the popular welfare, because these estimable qualities, once established in youth, persist into manhood as habits and thus benefit society and its members. Upon these notions modern psychology and moral science have cast much doubt.

Such moral qualities as courage, initiative, and the group of characteristics included in the term "sportsmanship" are probably not *inculcated* by athletics at all. If through inheritance a young man or



woman possesses them in whatever degree, athletic contests and games may effectually exercise them and through use strengthen them. The most that can be justifiably claimed is that athletics tend to develop in participants certain moral qualities that are already present. The medium through which this development may be accomplished is habits. No amount of athletic participation will create qualities that are inherently lacking.

Testimony from a number of deans and other administrative officers is to the effect that problems of college discipline tend to be less acute when larger proportions of undergraduates participate in athletics. In respect of university discipline, it is entirely possible that the present generation of college men and women possess, on the whole, more self-control and better manners than their predecessors. In any event, it is impossible, in considering breaches that attend upon athletic contests, to know whether they are chargeable more to athletics than to standards of daily life in the American community. . . .

The boasted "educational values" of athletics as they exist today in the American college leave much to be desired. The educational advantages that flow from inter-college contests are principally by-products. Those which result from intramural athletics are neither so strong nor so widespread as they could and should be made. . . . If the theory be adopted that education consists in the pupil's experiencing a series of situations as similar as possible to those he will encounter in afterschool life, the notion that our college athletics are "educational" falls miserably to pieces. Tested by this standard, physical education, to the extent that it includes many branches of intercollegiate athletics, has little value. Much the same is true with reference to those intramural sports in which interest and participation are grounded in compulsion to obtain credits for the degree. . . .

The root of all difficulties with the amateur status touches the desires of certain athletes to retain the prestige that amateurism confers and at the same time to reap the monetary or material rewards of professionalism. The results in college athletics and probably in other forms of competition have included equivocation, false statements concerning eligibility, and other forms of dishonesty, which are to be numbered among the fruits of commercialism. . . .

The fundamental causes of the defects of American college athletics are two: commercialism, and a negligent attitude toward the edu-

cational opportunity for which the college exists. To one, and generally to both, of these inter-acting causes, every shortcoming of college sport can be traced. Both may be abated, even if neither, in view of the imperfectibility of human nature, can ever be absolutely eliminated. . . .

Commercialism has made possible the erection of fine academic buildings and the increase of equipment from the profits of college athletics, but those profits have been gained because colleges have permitted the youths entrusted to their care to be openly exploited. At such colleges and universities the primary emphasis has been transferred from the things of the spirit or the mind to the material.

In general, university trustees are relatively innocent of commercialism by formal or tacit delegation of their responsibilities. Yet they have profited by it; the task of finding money for new equipment and buildings has been lightened. As for members of faculties, commercialism has added to their numbers through providing from athletic profits a part of the salaries of certain teachers.

Commercialism has added to the amusement of alumni, but it has corrupted the moral fibre of not a few of them through its temptations to recruit and subsidize.

It is the undergraduates who have suffered most and will continue most to suffer from commercialism and its results. True, the commercial policy has provided medical attention and hospitalization for injured athletes, but far fewer injuries would have resulted from uncommercialized games.

The argument that commercialism in college athletics is merely a reflection of the commercialism of modern life is specious. It is not the affair of the college or the university to reflect modern life. If the university is to be a socializing agency worthy of the name, it must endeavor to ameliorate the conditions of existence, spiritual as well as physical, and to train the men and women who shall lead the nations out of the bondage of those conditions. To neither of these missions does commercialism in college athletics soundly contribute.

The problems of college athletics, like other problems in human relationships, are not to be completely solved by formula, however much they may be temporarily changed. As in the case of single branches of competitive athletics, standards and rules form the conventions of sport, and so long as sport exists, it will have its conventions. But conventions are not formulas. It is often assumed

that if college athletics, as distinct from school athletics, are to contribute to education, they must be controlled (that is, restricted and curbed) through the direct action of faculties. This formula has failed at two points: If, on the one hand, it means delivering college athletics into the hands of men whose chief professional interest and means of livelihood they are, the result is not to check but to propagate commercialism. If, on the other hand, academic teachers on college faculties are placed in control, such men, being specialists, only in comparatively rare instances can and do give to the governance of college athletics that concentrated attention and devotion which they bestow upon their chosen fields of teaching and scholarship. Probably more than any other single factor, the operation of faculty control, even at its best, has tended to deprive the undergraduate of that opportunity of maturing under progressively increasing responsibility which an enlightened policy of guidance affords.

In the field of conduct and morals, vociferous proponents of college athletics have claimed for participants far greater benefits than athletics can probably ever yield, and, in attempting to evaluate these supposed benefits, have hailed the shadow as the substance. The workings of commercialism have almost obliterated the non-material aspects of athletics. And yet such qualities as loyalty, self-reliance, modesty, cooperation, self-sacrifice, courage, and, above all, honesty, can be more readily and directly cultivated through the activities and habits of the playing field than in almost any other phase of college life. What, therefore, is needed is not one set of moral and ethical standards for sports and games, and another for all other phases of college life, but a single set of standards so sincerely valued that by taking thought they can be made operative in life's every aspect. The transfer or spread of training implied is as much the affair of the academic teacher as of the coach or the director of physical education. It must begin with a diminished emphasis upon the material benefits of college athletics and a sincere resolution to substitute other and more lasting values for those that now are prized.

The prime needs of our college athletics are two—one particular and one general. The first is a change of values in a field that is sodden with the commercial and the material and the vested interests that these forces have created. Commercialism in college athletics must be diminished and college sport must rise to a point where it

is esteemed primarily and sincerely for the opportunities it affords to mature youth under responsibility, to exercise at once the body and the mind, and to foster habits both of bodily health and of those high qualities of character which, until they are revealed in action, we accept on faith.

The second need is more fundamental. The American college must renew within itself the force that will challenge the best intellectual capabilities of the undergraduate. Happily, this task is now engaging the attention of numerous college officers and teachers. Better still, the fact is becoming recognized that the granting of opportunity for the fulfilment of intellectual promise need not impair the socializing qualities of college sport. It is not necessary to "include athletics in the curriculum" of the undergraduate or to legislate out of them their life and spirit in order to extract what educational values they promise in terms of courage, independent thinking, cooperation, initiative, habits of bodily activity, and, above all, honesty in dealings between man and man.

THE TEACHER, AGAIN.<sup>1</sup>— . . . I am not here to deny his shortcomings. Indeed, I have in mind to speak of some of them before I get through, but first I think it fair to say that he is the victim of "outrageous fortune." No such creature as the pallid, bloodless ghost of a college professor now conjured up on the stage, in current literature and in the public mind generally has ever existed, in fact does not now exist and will, I dare say, never exist. . . .

Yet this distorted image of the college teacher remains fixed in the public mind, and I do not fool myself that anything we can say in meetings like this will serve as a corrective. Perhaps Hollywood, which now has become the *fons et origo* of the world's ideas of life and of truth, by presenting a picture of the college teacher as a "red-blooded he-man," playing poker and drinking bootleg, and running away with other men's wives, might rehabilitate him in public esteem as a competent guide, philosopher, and friend of flaming youth.

Meanwhile, if only as an academic pastime, it is interesting to ask and try to answer the question why it is that a third of a century ago there was little criticism of the college, whereas now when the equipment and teaching in the college are vastly better than they have ever been and when the offerings of the college have been incredibly enriched over the lean curriculum of the day before yester-

<sup>1</sup> Extracts from Address before the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Chicago, March 15, 1929.

day, slamming the college and the college teacher has become the all but universal avocation of the American people. . . .

Would it, then, be brash to say that society now seems determined to take over the college, to go through it on its own terms and to carry into and out of it its own sense of values, and that the college is battling with its back to the wall against the demand that it should be as responsive to public taste as, say, the front page of the modern newspaper? I am in theory a Jeffersonian democrat, and I believe that in the long run the will of the people will prevail. I am not sure what the deliberate collective wisdom of our people will turn out to be. I do not despair. But I do have a misgiving that society with its sense of values is more interested in Isadora Duncan than in Madame Curie, more interested in Dempsey than in Einstein, more interested in football than in calculus, more interested in Alpha Beta Zeta than in Phi Beta Kappa, more interested in the "side shows" than in the "main tent," and I fear that this sense of values is reflected upon every college campus in this country. . . .

How then shall the problem be resolved? I, for one, avow my incompetency by saying that I do not know. . . .

Perhaps if the professor should resist a bit more the tendency to set himself apart from his students—to put away absolutely all childish things—and should seek, instead, to understand, if not to share, their youthful interests and even their immature enthusiasms, then perhaps he might find them more ready and willing to seize and carry on the torch of learning which he holds out to them—a torch, mind you, not merely a ladle of scholastic erudition having no relation to their lives, but a torch to light them on their way. . . .

He has been trained in graduate schools which have insisted that he know more than all the rest of the world put together about some one thing and that he publish that knowledge in a thesis which must be a new contribution, and is once in a while a significant contribution, to the archives of civilization. . . .

Moreover, the colleges have themselves aided and abetted this narrowing of the field of vision by making technical research and publication thereof the *sine qua non* of appointments, promotions, and increases in salary. Is it any wonder, then, since we have it on sacred authority that "where a man's treasure is there will his heart be also," that here and there or now and then the professor has looked upon research as his main business and that teaching, like the grasshopper, has become a burden? I am speaking of the



research which is a religion—the passion “to follow knowledge like a sinking star beyond the utmost bounds of human thought,” which is the highest work of man and certainly the privilege and duty of the teacher; I am speaking rather of the research which is a fetish—a vastly different thing.

I do not intend to say that there are not still teachers of broad vision in the college. Happily there are. Happily there are still scholars who can view their special fields of learning in relation to life, scholars who “plucking the flower out of the crannied wall attempt to see in it and make others see in it “what God and man is,” scholars, I mean, who can teach; and I have noted that such teachers have never failed and do not now fail to interest even those whom Dean McConn terms our “kindergartners,” and whom Matthew Arnold lovingly called our “young barbarians at play.”

I should say that the attitude of the average professor who is open-minded is admirably expressed by the report made by the committee of this association on the professional training of college teachers two years ago. The professor is, for one thing, standoffish about methodology. He is not impressed, for example, by the intemperate attacks upon the lecture method. He knows, as well as any one else, that to drone out lecture notes to be regurgitated in examinations is vicious pedagogy, but he knows perfectly well that the lecture properly used is an excellent teaching device. Socrates could not and did not use the lecture method, but Aristotle could and did, and both were great teachers. Also he wrinkles his brow at the shibboleths which are flung at him from our schools of education. He does not understand, for instance, why it is a reproach to be a “subject teacher.” If he is not a moron, and usually he is not, he knows well enough that to set forth his subject without regard to his audience—to break a stone to his classes and call it the bread of life, and then complain of their lack of appetite—is a futile and stupid thing to do; but he is also alive to the fact that his students expect him, and rightly expect him, not only to understand them, but above all to “know his stuff.” He is perplexed by the doctrine that the subject-matter which is taught is only important as something on which to sharpen the teeth and claws of our thinking and that the residuum of years upon years of learning is merely the quality of sharpness, or that, as Mr. Bernard Shaw, the greatest of all purveyors of half-truths, puts it, “Education is what we have left after we have forgotten all that we have learned.” He knows,



as every one should know, that this simply is not true; at any rate it is not the whole truth. . . .

And yet, may I point out to you in this connection an amusing situation? . . . When a national convention meets to consider ways and means for the improvement of college teaching, like the meeting of the Association of American Colleges in Chattanooga two months ago, where some two hundred and seventy-five colleges were represented, it is attended mostly by presidents and deans, who *do not teach*.

Let us, however, be of good cheer. It is a mark of progress when presidents and deans, who presumably have something to do with the selection of teachers, place the improvement of teaching foremost in their deliberations. At any rate, the Chattanooga Convention, it seems to me, went to the very root of the matter in its urgent petition to our graduate schools to be a bit more conscious of the fact that, since three-fourths of their doctors of philosophy enter the profession of teaching they are in effect the teacher-training institutions for the colleges and universities. The recommendations to the graduate schools resolved upon by that convention are, I think you will agree with me, as interesting as they are sound:<sup>1</sup>

"That no graduate school admit to candidacy for the doctorate any student intending to engage in college teaching who has not a wide background of intellectual interest and experience.

"That efforts be made to give to each graduate student intending to engage in college teaching an adequate training in methods of teaching as applied to the department of knowledge in which the student is working.

"That each graduate school should offer to students intending to engage in college teaching an adequate and varied optional course in the instructional and administrative problems of the American college.

"That for those graduate students who are intending to engage in college teaching there be an optional quantitative relaxation of the research requirement; and

"That heads of departments in graduate schools regard it as a part of their task to acquaint themselves with all readily ascertainable evidence as to the teaching ability of their graduate students. . . ."

Knowledge of one's subject, not only in itself but in its relationships, and reverence for that knowledge as an instrument of free-

<sup>1</sup> These proposals await consideration at the annual meeting of the Association.—*Editor*

dom; knowledge of one's students and reverence for what they have in them to become—are not these the prime requisites of a pedagogy which may enlist the partnership of our students with us in the common business of education?

GEORGE NORLIN, President of the University of Colorado,  
*School and Society*

THE IMPROVEMENT OF MODERN LANGUAGE TEACHING.—It is doubtful if there is any subject on the college curriculum which is more disappointing in its results to college administrators and to the general public than the foreign languages. It is perhaps the subject which can be tested most widely and accurately in its practical application and which shows defects of instruction in most glaring colors in the post graduation years. . . .

Certainly there is no subject on which the dead hand of tradition lies so heavily as on foreign language teaching. The Renaissance took away Latin as a universally understood language of scholarship and brought the curse of the Tower of Babel on the intellectual world. Unfortunately, also, it brought with the revival of philology from its thousand years of sleep, two attitudes which have worked directly against the removal of the Babel curse: a passion for formal grammar and an enthusiasm for the historical method of language study. Even the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have not succeeded in making the approach to foreign language study generally a practical-experimental one. . . .

The first answer which probably occurs to everyone who seeks to explain the unsatisfactory results of the teaching of foreign languages is that the teacher of French or German or Spanish does not know what he is trying to do. . . .

We are astonished when we find that psychology has made such small and ineffective beginnings in sounding out the processes of language learning. In the twenty-nine years since Wundt applied psychological principles to some of the general problems of language on a wide scale, progress in the analyses of the processes of language learning has been very slow. Little is known regarding the growth of oral vocabulary or the reason for individual differences in the formation of foreign sounds or the effect of discontinuance in language practice. Expert studies in reading, like those carried on by Judd and Buswell at the University of Chicago, have just begun to furnish definite data respecting the speed and span and accuracy of percep-

tion at various stages in learning to read. Nothing definite is known regarding the relationship between oral practice and silent reading in learning to read or of the influence of age on the learning process or of the correlation of the various abilities involved in reading with comprehension. The difficulty lies, no doubt, in the highly complex characteristics of the language learning processes, a complexity which has been emphasized by recent experiments with prognosis tests in foreign languages. It is certain that the psychologists have still a long way to go before many of these questions will have reached a solution. . . .

Whatever confusion prevails regarding the value for the American young man and young woman of the various ultimate goals to be attained through foreign language study, there is universal agreement that the ability to read is the first goal. . . .

The first step in the improvement of modern language teaching, then, is a concentration on the reading objective. The concentration becomes all the more important when we recall how short a time the American college curriculum assigns for foreign language study. This is for nearly 60 per cent of all the French students in the colleges a maximum of two years; for practically one-half of the Spanish and German students it is one year. This calls for experimentation with rapid-fire methods of acquiring reading ability and promising experiments in this direction have already been made at the University of Iowa and the University of Chicago, and especially in India, where at Dacca College in Bengal astounding results have been attained in speeding up the process of teaching Bengali boys to read English. All of these experiments have certain common features: the elimination of all formal grammar except an iron ration of fundamentals which have been shown by experiment as necessary for understanding a text; the careful gradation of vocabulary material which is arranged on a basis of the commonest words, not selected by subjective judgment but based on frequency counts like Thorndike's *English Word List*, or those published for Spanish, German, and French by the Modern Foreign Language Study. Hand in hand with this careful selection of word material, progressively introduced, goes the effort to test pupils for understanding what they have read without translating it into the mother tongue and a persistent effort to keep before the student's mind the objective which is sought. Furthermore, the constant registration of the learner's progress by means of standardized tests holds in his

view his present stage of efficiency and the goal toward which he is traveling. . . .

The tests which have been copyrighted for the American Council by the Modern Foreign Language Study make it possible to measure, against nation-wide norms, achievement in vocabulary, grammar, reading and writing for French, German, and Spanish, the three modern languages of major interest to the schools and colleges. At last we have some standards to go by and are no longer wandering in the woods where teachers' marks and unstandardized examinations, subjectively made and subjectively graded, keep the student in a state of suspicion and resentment and generate in the mind of the conscientious teacher a condition of uncertainty and remorse. . . .

The ability to measure one class with the same yardstick that is employed for other classes of shorter or longer periods of training, or both, is the greatest corrective for defective class organization, and it may be said that the worst evils of the well-nigh criminal misplacement of students in foreign language classes which Professor Wood and Professor Henmon have shown to exist in some of the best schools of the country would disappear if a persistent administration of standardized tests over a series of terms should keep this distorted picture before teachers and administrative officers.

Aside from their value for organization purposes, these tests have a clinical importance for modern language teachers which is abundantly shown by the report of Professor Henmon and that to be issued soon by Professor Coleman. They show wide differences in the weight of emphasis placed on the different capacities in different schools, variations that are due to no conscious differences of ultimate social objectives, for in most cases the modern language teacher is anything but clear as to these, but are due to the varying theories, habits, and methods of individual teachers or to following of the path of tradition and of least resistance by examining bureaus like the College Entrance Examination Board. . . .

The third road by which an improvement in foreign language teaching will come is through an intensive study of curriculum material and a reconstruction of the curriculum on a basis determined, not by scholastic tradition or the judgment of any textbook maker or groups of textbook makers, but by an objective investigation of the habits of the language to be taught. There must be modifications, of course, due to the conditions of teaching a language in a country of other speech, but in the main no one can deny that the

words or idioms of French or German or Spanish ought to be learned in the same sequence of frequency as that in which they appear in the language itself. The only reason for learning a word or locution is its usefulness, and usefulness is determined by use. It is, or ought to be, obvious that the most useful expressions are those that occur with the greatest frequency and that the order in which we should learn these elements of speech should follow the order in which opportunity will arise to use them. . . .

The present age is as insistent as any one that has preceded it that education should orient itself toward the service of mankind and this insistence is the greater in this country, which is now opening the doors of higher education to every qualified student. It is all the more gratifying, therefore, that paths have been cleared by which instruction in the foreign languages may be able to prove its fitness for an enduring place on the American school and college program.

ROBERT HERNDON FIFE, Columbia University,  
Head of the Commission on Instruction in Modern Languages,  
*The Educational Record*



## LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ACADEMIC FREEDOM.—Although not originally intended for publication, the following statement in a letter from Mr. L. L. Hubbard, a trustee of the University, is herewith quoted with the permission of the writer:

"Fifty years ago A. Ten Brook, one of Michigan's prominent professors (*American State Universities*, p. 285), in connection with the discussion of religious freedom, which was or is even a more delicate subject than that of historical deductions [wrote as follows]:

'It is indeed expected that the subjects assigned them (the professors) severally to teach, will be first attended to; that the teaching of these will be their main business, and in their several classrooms, their sole business. . . . Students and professors lose no rights which they before possessed, except those which are distinctly given up in their contracts with the university. These contracts involve nothing but good moral conduct and faithful discharge of their duties in the classroom, and other exercises actually laid down in the program of duties. They may have arrangements for literary, and social, and why not for religious improvement, outside of their college work.'

"There is nothing in our By-laws, nor to my knowledge, in our modern practice that controverts that doctrine. Generally speaking, professors outside the classroom are private citizens.

"Professors are human beings like all of us. Some of them at times wound the susceptibilities even of Regents, but we try to cultivate the grace of charity toward them because of their other good qualities. Professors must be chosen for their teaching ability and their supposed eminence in their several specialties; and here let me say that they are expected to teach their students to think and to draw their own conclusions, rather than to fill the students up with data or doctrine that may be obsolete in the next generation. Some people believe that knowledge is progressive. Research uncovers evidence that, if not unknown to our forebears, has at least lain hidden from us. Quoting again from Ten Brook (l. c. p. 191); 'if the historian feels that he must eliminate from his material all that can ever give offense, it were well that he relinquish his task of writing.' His evidence may properly be weighed and applied. It cannot be ignored. Each person may make from it his own deductions, and state them—in his own manner, at his own risk. If he is in error,



or if his manner be in bad taste, or lack dignity, so much the worse for him. Discriminating critics will in the end take care of that. Of course this doctrine does not cover anarchy nor treason."

**SOUTH DAKOTA STATE COLLEGE, A PROTEST.**—Several members of the Association in this institution have sent for publication in the *Bulletin*, an extended criticism of the conclusions of the report published in the December, 1928, *Bulletin*, and of the method of conducting the investigation. With the approval of the Council, publication was ultimately refused. Such investigations, difficult at the best, depend for their value on the disinterestedness of the investigators. It would, therefore, be contrary to sound policy to depend on local members or chapters to make investigations in their own institutions. It would be equally contrary to sound policy to accept for publication criticism by local members of published reports. Such criticism will always receive, as in the present case, due attention from the Council and responsible committees of the Association, and may have a real effect on the general policy of the Association in dealing with future business of this character. A copy of the present protest will be furnished on request.

**OFFICIAL VISITS.**—President Crew has recently addressed the chapters at the University of Illinois and Lake Forest University on the nature and objects of the Association. Professor Mayer, the Treasurer, in charge of the Washington office has addressed the chapters at the University of Maryland and George Washington University.

## MEMBERSHIP

The Committee on Admission announces the election of one hundred and seventy-two active and seventy-one junior members, as follows:

### ACTIVE MEMBERS ELECTED

**Albion College**, Thomas M. Carter; **Baldwin-Wallace College**, E. L. Fullmer; **Battle Creek College**, Elia Y. Melekian; **Bethany College**, J. C. Moos; **Butler College**, S. E. Elliott; **Central College**, W. M. Alexander, Frank L. Hager, Bertram I. Lawrence; **University of California (Berkeley)**, Winifred E. Allen, S. C. Brooks, J. L. Collins, Edward W. Gifford, Margaret T. Hodgen, George F. McEwen, C. W. Porter, Arnold H. Rowbotham, F. B. Sumner; **University of California (Los Angeles)**, Gordon H. Ball, Foss R. Brockway, F. F. Burtchett, Harold G. Calhoun, Leo P. Delsasso, Joseph W. Ellis, Ira N. Fusbee, Raymond Garver, A. M. Johnson, Benjamin W. Johnson, Adrian D. Keller, John F. Kessel, W. A. Kincaid, James W. Marsh, Francisco Montau, Chas. H. Paxton, J. B. Phillips, Edgar K. Soper, Marvel M. Stockwell, Arthur H. Warner, Clifford M. Zierer; **University of Colorado**, Elmer O. Bergman, Harry G. Carlson, Phil R. Clugston, Edward D. Crabb, C. L. Eckel, Herbert J. Gilkey, Aubrey J. Kempner, Henryetta Reynolds, Paul F. Shope, Frances P. Stribic; **Western State College of Colorado**, Carl A. Helmecke; **Connecticut College**, Bessie Bloom Wessel; **Cornell University**, Max Ludwig W. Laistner; **Dalhousie University**, Robert A. MacKay, Norman J. Symons; **Elon College**, Ralph B. Tower; **Emory University**, Clarence E. Boyd, Mercer G. Evans; **Florida State College for Women**, Guy L. Diffenbaugh, Anna F. Liddell, Eleanor B. Scott; **Haverford College**, William E. Lunt; **University of Idaho**, Cornelius J. Brosnan, Alberto Vazquez; **University of Illinois**, Clarence A. Berdahl, William C. Rose; **University of Iowa**, Herbert O. Lyte, Edward P. T. Tyndall; **Iowa State College**, Esther L. Cooper, W. F. Guard, Leonard T. Richardson; **Johns Hopkins University**, J. Allen Scott; **Kalamazoo College**, Ernest B. Harper; **University of Kentucky**, Abner W. Kelley; **Louisiana State University**, Warren N. Christopher; **University of Louisville**, Wm. C. Mallalieu; **Marshall College**, Homer H. Dubs, H. G. Wheat; **Massachusetts Institute of Technology**, William Emerson, Richard H. Frazier, H. W. Gardner, Frederick G. Keyes, Lepine H. Rice, Erwin H.

Schell, A. G. Silverman, Theodore H. Taft; **University of Michigan**, George Y. Rainich; **University of Minnesota**, Andrew Boss, Royal N. Chapman, Wilbur H. Cherry, Donald N. Ferguson, Frederic B. Garver, Florence L. Goodenough, Richard Hartshorne, Herbert Heaton, Earl Hudelson, O. B. Jesness, Mary S. Knyper, Arthur W. Marget, W. E. Peik, Harlow C. Richardson, Adolph R. Ringoen, Henry Rottschaefer, Charles F. Shoop, Clinton R. Stauffer, George A. Thiel, Frank K. Walter, Malcolm M. Willey; **University of Missouri**, Harmon O. De Graff; **Montana State College**, Oden E. Sheppard; **University of Nebraska**, John L. La Monte; **College of the City of New York**, Oscar Wm. Irvin; **New York State College for Teachers**, Minnie B. Scotland; **University of North Carolina**, Frederick P. Brooks; **Northern Normal and Industrial College**, George W. Bloemendal; **Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College**, J. H. Caldwell, Walter Hendricks Echols, Guy A. Lackey, H. G. Thuesen; **Oregon State College**, Merritt M. Chambers, Wm. Henry Dreesen, Rosalind Wulzen; **Park College**, Merlin C. Findlay; **University of Pennsylvania**, George L. Amrhein, Perry A. Caris, Clyde M. Kahler, C. A. Kulp, A. Nelson Sayre; **University of Pittsburgh**, Marion K. McKay, Reginald H. Scott, W. N. St. Peter; **Princeton University**, Wilbur S. Hulin, Waldo Westwater; **University of Porto Rico**, C. Calor Mota; **Rollins College**, Joseph S. Bueno; **Rose Polytechnic Institute**, B. A. Howlett; **University of Saskatchewan**, James M. D. Scott; **Smith College**, Elizabeth Avery, Margaret B. Crook; **Southwestern University**, Robert V. Guthrie, F. C. A. Lehmberg, Henry E. Meyer, M. L. Williams; **St. Lawrence University**, Edward P. Harris, Sarah Plaisance; **Sweet Briar College**, Caroline L. Sparrow; **Syracuse University**, J. Ralph Foster; **University of Texas**, H. J. Leon; **Texas Technological College**, Allan L. Carter, John C. Granbery; **Thiel College**, Richard Beck; **Tulane University**, Edward A. Bechul, Rufus C. Harris, John M. McByrde; **Ursinus College**, Elizabeth B. White; **State College of Washington**, Maynard L. Daggy, R. H. B. Jones; **Wellesley College**, Ruth A. Damon, Edward C. Ehrensperger, Marguerite Hearsey, Edith W. Moses, Lawrence Smith, Walter B. Smith; **Wells College**, Else M. Fleissner; **Western Reserve University**, Walter T. Dunmore, B. R. McElderry, Jr.; **University of Wichita**, Lambertus Hekhuis; **University of Wisconsin**, Mark H. Ingraham, Wilfred Payne; **Yale University**, Rubert S. Anderson, John E. Gee, S. M. Pargellis, Frederick A. Pottle, Robert W. Seitz.

**TRANSFER FROM JUNIOR TO ACTIVE MEMBERSHIP**

G. L. Corley (Chemistry), Louisville

John Henry Davis, Jr. (Biology), Davidson

**JUNIOR MEMBERS ELECTED**

Antioch College, Robert E. Hiller; **University of Arizona**, Fred-  
eric E. Coenen, John M. Weidenschilling; **University of California**,  
Harrison S. Mendenhall, Mignonette Spilman; **University of**  
**Chicago**, Walter J. Wahnsiedler; **Columbia University**, Charles D.  
Bohannon; **Cornell University**, K. Carl Walz, Edna S. Winters;  
**Emory University**, William H. Jones; **Florida State College for**  
**Women**, Marion J. Hay; **University of Florida**, Edward T. Board-  
man; **Hunter College**, Jessie Dunsmore; **University of Iowa**, James  
W. Pugsley; **Iowa State College**, Ora B. Burright; **Johns Hopkins**  
**University**, Maurice Chazin; **Kansas State Teachers College**,  
Robert G. Brehmer, Jr.; **University of Kentucky**, Louis Clifton,  
Ellen Scott; **University of Maryland**, Gertrude Bergman, Thomas  
Pyles; **Massachusetts Institute of Technology**, Arthur R. Ford,  
James B. Greeley, Myron S. Huckle, Sebastian B. Littauer; **Uni-**  
**versity of Minnesota**, Isabel R. Abbott; **University of North Caro-**  
**lina**, Loula M. Pangle, Maxwell G. Pangle, Harvey A. Ljung, Man-  
ning M. Pattillo, Marie E. Riess, Paul W. Shankweiler, Paul J.  
Steele, Ethel R. Ward; **Oberlin College**, Olive Hoffman, **Okla-**  
**homa University**, Ralph D. Bird, Maurice Halperin, Ruth Holzapfel,  
Louise E. Perkinson, Estella A. Rachley, Alfred B. Thomas;  
**University of Pennsylvania**, Enos E. Witmer; **Princeton University**,  
Joseph E. Baker, Hamilton Cottier, Daniel Katz, De Vaux de  
Lancey, Lawrence Gahagan, Richard V. Lindabury, Edward L.  
Newbury, Thurman C. Scott; **Radcliffe College**, Rachel Clark,  
Elizabeth H. Norton, Mabel A. E. Steele; **Syracuse University**,  
Raymond G. Carey; **University of Washington**, Sarah H. Brown;  
**Washington University**, Zola K. Cooper, Dorothy B. Wilkinson;  
**State College of Washington**, M. E. Souza; **West Virginia Uni-**  
**versity**, Henry Cremer; **Willamette University**, Cecil R. Monk; **Of**  
**recent University Connection**, Evelyn I. Banning (M.A. Mills),  
Portland, Oregon; John M. Barra (M.A. George Wash.), Wash-  
ington, D. C.; William W. Biddle (Teachers College, Columbia),  
Port Washington, N. Y.; Elizabeth I. Heiser (Ph.D. American),  
Washington, D. C.; Ellen D. Leyburn (M.A. Radcliffe), Buffalo,  
N. Y.; Rudolph Macy, (Maine), Aberdeen, Md.; Karl Reuning,

(Wisconsin), Breslau, Germany; Walter A. Schulze (California), Goldthwaite, Texas; Jane P. Sherman (Brown), Hope Valley, R. I.; Edna S. Smith (M.A. George Wash.), Grosse Ile, Mich.; William K. Wimsatt, Jr. (A.B. Georgetown), Washington, D. C.

## NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following one hundred and one nominations for active membership and twenty-four nominations for junior membership are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, 26 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions<sup>1</sup> and will be considered by the Committee if received before December 25, 1929.

The Committee on Admissions consists of Frederick Slocum, Wesleyan, Chairman; W. C. Allee (Biol.), Chicago; A. L. Bouton, New York; E. S. Brightman, Boston; E. C. Hinsdale, Mt. Holyoke; A. C. Lane, Tufts; A. O. Lovejoy, Johns Hopkins; W. T. Magruder, Ohio State; Julian Park, Buffalo.

G. A. Abbott (Chemistry), North Dakota  
Victor L. Albjerg (History), Purdue  
E. X. Anderson (Chemistry), North Dakota  
E. C. Angst (Botany), Oklahoma  
James W. Baldwin (Education), Texas  
Bee M. Barry (Fine Arts), Oklahoma  
F. L. Baumann (History), Grinnell  
J. E. Belcher (Chemistry), Oklahoma  
L. Theodore Bellmont (Physical Education), Texas  
E. E. Bennett (History, Political Science), Montana  
Annie W. Blanton (Education), Texas  
Alexander Brede (English), City of Detroit  
Edmund Caskie (Modern Languages), U. S. Naval Academy  
B. F. Catherwood (Economics), Illinois  
A. E. Chandler (Economics), Oklahoma  
Rose B. Clark (Education), Nebraska Wesleyan  
E. D. Coon (Chemistry), North Dakota  
James C. Corliss (Romance Languages), George Washington  
Montgomery M. Culver (Mathematics), Pittsburgh  
Virgil Homer Dassel (Business Administration), Wittenberg  
Roy W. Deal (Education), Nebraska Wesleyan  
V. L. Dedeck (Modern Languages), St. Teresa  
G. M. Dieterich (Music), Oklahoma  
E. P. R. Duval (Mathematics), Oklahoma  
Eldon B. Engle (Agronomy), Nebraska

<sup>1</sup> Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Washington office, 26 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.



George W. Fiero (Pharmacy), Buffalo  
Dixon R. Fox (History), Columbia  
Wm. Bryan Gates (English), Texas Technological  
Warner E. Gettys (Sociology), Texas  
Harley L. Gibb (History), City of Detroit  
Erma M. Gill (English), Texas  
Philip Graham (English), Texas  
B. F. Harrison (Business Administration), Texas  
E. G. Hassell (Music), Oklahoma  
H. W. Herrington (English), Syracuse  
Harold G. Hewitt (Chemistry), Buffalo  
Raymond G. Hieber (Physics), Rose Polytechnic  
Ray E. Holcombe (Dramatic Art), Oklahoma  
R. E. Hyde (Education), Fairmont State Normal  
Annie Irvine (English), Texas  
William H. Irving (English), Northwestern  
Francis E. Johnston (Mathematics), George Washington  
Raymond T. Johnson (Law), Washington and Lee  
Eleanor Keller (Chemistry), Barnard  
Bertha K. Krauss (Library Economy), Montana  
D. T. Krauss (Business Administration), Wittenberg  
Fritz-Konrad Kruger (Political Science), Wittenberg  
Quincy A. Kuehner (Education), Temple  
C. T. Langford (Chem. Engineering), Oklahoma  
Oscar Z. Lehrer (Music), Oklahoma  
Gretchen Lee (Physical Education), Buffalo  
David D. Leib (Mathematics), Connecticut  
Charles P. Light, Jr. (Law), Washington and Lee  
John M. Longaker (English), Pennsylvania  
Louis A. Mallory (English), Wyoming  
James W. McBain (Chemistry), Stanford  
Norman Macdonald (European History), Lehigh  
Lucy N. McLane (English), Colorado Teachers  
Robert H. McNeil (English), Virginia Polytechnic  
Marguerite Mespoulet (French), Wellesley  
A. James Miller (Pathology), Louisville  
Susan E. Millier (Home Economics), Oklahoma  
Chas. E. F. Mollett (Pharmacy), Montana  
Elizabeth L. Moore (Romance Languages), St. Lawrence  
George A. Moore (Zoology), Oklahoma A. and M.

John W. Moore (Medicine), Louisville  
Ruth E. Moore (Fine Arts), Oklahoma  
Edward J. Petry (Biology), Central  
Josephine M. Phelan (English), Wyoming  
C. H. Richardson (Mathematics), Bucknell  
Frederick Roehm (Education), Baldwin-Wallace  
Maximilian Rudwin (Modern Languages), Wyoming  
Mable Russell (Applied Art), Iowa State  
John Rydjord (History), Wichita  
John J. Savage (Latin, Greek), Brown  
William S. Schmidt (Fine Arts), Oklahoma  
Rex H. Schoonover (Mathematics), City of Detroit  
Eleanor M. Sickels (English), Montana  
Gilbert H. Smith (Sociology), Oklahoma  
Maurice G. Smith (Anthropology), Oklahoma  
J. D. Stafford (English), City of Toledo  
Merrill A. Stainbrook (Geology), Texas Technological  
Albert E. Staniland (Mathematics), Pittsburgh  
Floyd Stovall (English), Texas  
Alfred B. Strehli (Spanish), Texas Technological  
D. J. Strunk (Mathematics) Massachusetts Institute of Technology  
Louise I. Trenholme (History), Missouri  
F. W. Tuttle (Economics), Washington and Jefferson  
E. C. Unnewehr (Physics), Baldwin-Wallace  
Clement Vollmer (German), Duke  
J. G. Wahlin (Biology), Montana  
Clark Warburton (Economics), Emory  
Dorothy W. Weeks (Mathematics), Wellesley  
Wm. R. Wehrend (Fine Arts), Oklahoma  
John Wilcox (English), City of Detroit  
Eliza G. Wilkins (Classical Languages), Hood  
Chas. W. Williams (Economics), Louisville  
John Woodard (Biology), Wittenberg  
John I. Woodard (Education), Cincinnati  
Alfred J. Wright (Geography), Ohio State  
Adrian Wynnobel (Fine Arts), Oklahoma

#### NOMINATIONS FOR JUNIOR MEMBERSHIP

H. F. Alderfer (Political Science), Pennsylvania State  
Eldon A. Ardrey (Music), Yankton

Moses J. Aronson (Sociology), Syracuse  
John L. Bloxsome (English), Rose Polytechnic  
William Lyman Branch (Electrical Engineering), Pittsburgh  
M. Gertrude Buckhous (Library Economy), Montana  
Harve N. Chinn (Civil Engineering), Rose Polytechnic  
William H. Clashman (Biology), Louisville  
D. T. Cornwall (Geology), Oklahoma  
Mildred A. Groscurth (Zoology), Oklahoma  
Donald E. V. Henderson, Rice Institute  
George H. Hill, North Carolina  
James C. KaKavas (Physiology), Delaware  
Harold C. Koch (Chemical Engineering), Rose Polytechnic  
Earl La Fon (Mathematics), Oklahoma  
Tessie Rudell (Music), Oklahoma  
Andrew J. Russell (Law), Louisville  
Catherine Staudt (Romance Languages), Carleton  
Mary M. Taylor (Mathematics), Pittsburgh  
Celeste Whaley (Zoology), Oklahoma  
E. J. Wotawa (Music), Louisville  
Elkin C. Wilson (English), Northwestern  
Clarke C. Zeliff (Chemistry), Yale  
David E. Davis (Mech. Engineering), 1421 Lincoln Ave., Moores, Pa.  
(of recent university connection)



LIBRARY OF THE  
PHYSICAL EDUCATION  
DEPARTMENT  
VOLUME XV

NUMBER 8

DEC 23 1929

BULLETIN  
OF THE  
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF  
UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

ANNUAL MEETING  
UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH  
COLLEGE ATHLETICS

DECEMBER, 1929



## OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR 1929

## PRESIDENT

HENRY CREW<sup>1</sup> (*Physics*) Northwestern University

## VICE-PRESIDENT

H. C. WARREN (*Psychology*) Princeton University

**SECRETARY**

H. W. TYLER<sup>1</sup> (*Mathematics*)      Mass. Institute of Technology

**TREASURER**

JOSEPH MAYER<sup>1</sup> (*Economics*) Tufts College

### MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

For term ending December 31, 1929

ERNEST BERNBAUM<sup>1</sup> (*English*)      University of Illinois

R. M. BIRD (Chemistry)  
University of Virginia

KATHERINE GALLAGHER (*History*) Goucher College

E. E. HALZ (*English*) Union College

E. R. HEDRICK (*Mathematics*) University of California (Los Angeles)

ERNEST MERRITT (*Physics*) Cornell University

H. J. MULLER (*Zoology*) University of Texas

G. W. STEWART (*Physics*) University of Iowa

R. H. TRUE (*Botany*)                      University of Pennsylvania

KARL YOUNG (*English*) Yale University

For term ending December 31, 1930

E. G. CONKLIN<sup>1</sup> (*Biology*) Princeton University

W. W. COOK<sup>1</sup> (Law) Johns Hopkins University

R. E. DENGLER<sup>1</sup> (*Greek*)      Pennsylvania State College

W. L. EVANS (*Chemistry*)                      Ohio State University

J. P. GOODE (*Geography*) University of Chicago

W. K. HATT (Civil Engineering) Purdue University

A. C. Ivy (*Medicine*) Northwestern University

ELIZABETH R. LAIRD (*Physics*) Mt. Holyoke College

C. E. MAGNUSSON (*Electrical Engineering*) University of Washington

W. M. PERSONS (*Economics*) Harvard University

For term ending December 31, 1931

B. H. BODE (*Philosophy*) Ohio State University

M. T. BOGERT (*Chemistry*)  
Columbia University

A. L. BONDURANT (*Classics*) University of Mississippi

H. S. CONARD (*Botany*) Grinnell College

H. G. DOYLE (*Romance Languages*) George Washington University

P. O. RAY (*Political Science*) University of California (Berkeley)

F. K. RICHTMEYER (Physics) Cornell University

JOEL STEBBINS (*Astronomy*) University of Wisconsin

H. S. WHITE (*Mathematics*)  
University of Wisconsin  
Vassar College

H. V. WILSON (*Biology*) University of North Carolina

*Ex-officio (until end of year noted)*

A. O. LEUSCHNER (*Astronomy*) (1930) University of California

W. T. SEMPLE (*Classics*) (1932) University of Cincinnati

Members of the Executive Committee

This BULLETIN, issued monthly except in June, July, August, and September, contains information in regard to the current work and plans of the American Association of University Professors.

## PUBLICATIONS OF THE ASSOCIATION

(A list of publications prior to 1927 will be sent on application.)

- January, 1927, Vol. XIII, No. 1. Constitution and List of Members.  
February, 1927, Vol. XIII, No. 2. Annual Meeting; Educational Discussion.  
March, 1927, Vol. XIII, No. 3. Degree of Doctor of Philosophy; Presidential Reports.  
April, 1927, Vol. XIII, No. 4. Educational Discussion; List of Committees.  
May, 1927, Vol. XIII, No. 5. Committee A, Academic Freedom and Tenure; Societies and Foundations.  
October, 1927, Vol. XIII, No. 6. Report on the University of Louisville.  
November, 1927, Vol. XIII, No. 7. Annual Meeting; Educational Discussion.  
December, 1927, Vol. XIII, No. 8. Local Chapter Problems; Laws against Teaching Evolution; Index.  
January, 1928, Vol. XIV, No. 1. Constitution; List of Members; Committees.  
February, 1928, Vol. XIV, No. 2. Annual Meeting; Committee Reports; Reports of Officers.  
March, 1928, Vol. XIV, No. 3. Presidential Addresses; Foreign Language Study and Requirements.  
April, 1928, Vol. XIV, No. 4. Art Instruction in Colleges and Universities; British Degrees for Americans.  
May, 1928, Vol. XIV, No. 5. Reviews; Association of American Colleges.  
October, 1928, Vol. XIV, No. 6. Annual Meeting; Reviews.  
November, 1928, Vol. XIV, No. 7. Annual Meeting; Educational Discussion.  
December, 1928, Vol. XIV, No. 8. Appointment Service; Index.  
January, 1929, Vol. XV, No. 1. Constitution; List of Members.  
February, 1929, Vol. XV, No. 2. Annual Meeting; Organization and Conduct of Local Chapters.  
March, 1929, Vol. XV, No. 3. Methods of Appointment and Promotion.  
April, 1929, Vol. XV, No. 4. Boston University, Anti-Evolution Laws and Religious Neutrality.  
May, 1929, Vol. XV, No. 5. Carnegie Foundation, Incomes and Living Costs.  
October, 1929, Vol. XV, No. 6. Academic Freedom and Tenure Statements—Marshall College, Michigan State College.  
November, 1929, Vol. XV, No. 7. Oklahoma A. and M. College; California Pension Report.

Single copies of any of the above, except as noted, thirty-five cents. Subscription price, two dollars and fifty cents per volume.

H. W. TYLER, Secretary, 26 Jackson Place, Washington, D. C.